The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1890.

The Week.

"THE normal condition of a deliberative assembly is one of free and untrammelled debate," said Mr. Reed on the 12th of February, 1885, in the House of Representatives. On the 15th of September, 1890, there came before the House of Representatives a tariff bill which its champions say is to remain the law of the land for a number of years. The Senate had made a number of important amendments, changing radically the sugar schedule from the form in which it passed the House, establishing a permanent Tariff Commission, and giving the President, through a provision for reciprocity, the exclusive power of keeping off or putting on taxes upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides. This last is the most important action regarding the taxing power which it has ever been proposed that Congress should take, and demands the most careful consideration. It was opposed in the Senate by one of the ablest lawyers on the Republican side as unconstitutional, and members of the House were entitled to hear the arguments for and against it before casting their votes. Yet Speaker Reed allowed only two hours for debate of the whole tariff question on Monday, and would not permit a separate vote on the reciprocity amendment or any other of the changes in the bill made by the Senate. The only motion allowed was one to non-concur in all the Senate amendments and send the bill to a conference committee, which was of course carried by a party vote. When that committee reports it back, the only motion that can be made will be to accept or reject its work as a whole. In other words, the House is denied all opportunity to express its opinion upon reciprocity, the changes in the sugar schedule, or any other Senate amendment, and everything is to be settled in secret by a conference committee, which in turn will simply ratify the decisions of the Speaker.

Really, it seems hardly worth while to keep up the forms of a House of Representatives. Practically the will of the Speaker is the action of the House. Why keep the other 329 members in Washington? To be sure, the Constitution provides that "the House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States"; but so, also, it provides that "the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." It is now proposed by act of Congress to transfer the power of laying taxes to the President. Why not also, by act of Congress, transfer the power of legislation, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, from the whole body of members to the Speaker? This would be only a formal recognition of the existing situation. It may be objected that it would be unconstitutional. But so, also, is the reciprocity provision.

Before the final vote was taken in the Senate on the Aldrich reciprocity amendment to the Tariff Bill, Mr. Evarts proposed to change it so as to bring it into conformity with the Constitution of the United States. Instead of giving the President authority at his caprice to put on or take off duties—in other words, to exercise the taxing power which the Constitution commits to Congress—the New York Senator proposed to provide that, whenever the President should consider the action of other nations regarding our products reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he should "communicate to Congress the facts which he shall have ascertained, to the end that such duties may be imposed upon the above-recited articles and exempted from duty by this act as Congress, in view of the failure of reciprocal action on the part of any foreign nation or nations, shall determine." Unfortunately, only two Republican Senators joined Mr. Evarts, and both of them men of the third rank (Dolph of Oregon and Sanders of Montana), even Mr. Edmunds voting in the negative, so that the constitutional method of dealing with the subject was rejected by a vote of 30 yeas to 34 nays.

When one reads the McKinley Bill and considers it as the summer's occupation of the Legislature of the richest and most prosperous country in the world, composed of men of mature age and presumably more than average gravity of mind and character, it is impossible to avoid treating some portions of it as comic literature. Take for instance that very mild, and harmless, and very cheap beverage known as "ginger ale." One would think this would escape notice in an assembly of this kind. It bore a duty of 20 per cent., for some reason to us unknown, before Maj. McKinley took it up. He appears to have discovered that to let it in at 20 per cent. in any kind of bottle would work some sort of mischief to the community. So he has provided "that if imported in plain green, or colored moulded or pressed-glass bottles containing each not more than three-fourths of a pint," it is to bear, in addition to the 20 per cent. ad valorem, "10 cents per dozen." Should, however, some importer conceive the diabolical idea of importing it in bottles "containing more than three-fourths of a pint each or not more than one and a half pints," his attack on the national interests is to be met by a duty of "twenty cents per dozen." But should some more than ordinarily depraved trader try to introduce it "otherwise than in plain green or colored moulded or pressed-glass bottles, or in such bottles containing more than one and a half pints each," this particular variety of iniquity is to be repressed by a duty of "fifty cents per gallon," besides a duty on the bottles "at the rates which would be chargeable thereto if imported empty." What prompted this bit of infantile folly? Probably a visit from some little manufacturer of poor ginger beer in New York or Philadelphia, who got a little bottleman to go with him, and represent that with more protection he would be relieved from the necessity of improving his own coarse and sweet stuff, and be able to force it on some people who now drink the light and wholesome foreign product instead.

There is great complaint among the importers about the date at which the McKinley Bill is to go into operation (October 1), and over the announcement that goods in bonded warehouses will be liable to duty under the act unless removed before November 1. They say that never before in this or any other civilized country has an increase of duties been clapped on goods shipped from foreign countries before the increase was made, or clapped retroactively on goods already landed, and that many a merchant whose goods are now on the ocean may be ruined or suffer serious loss from the change in the law. We agree with all this, of course, but we must explain to the aggrieved parties that the reason of it is that the majority in Congress have adopted and deliberately hold the theory that the importation of foreign goods is an immoral business, somewhat in the nature of piracy; that the persons engaged in it are therefore not entitled to any consideration at the hands of the Legislature; that it is true that in times past they have received due notice of any change in the rate of customs duties, but that this was an indulgence which ought never to have been extended to a semi-criminal class, and it is, therefore, ridiculous of them to complain of its withdrawal. This view naturally sounds very droll to all intelligent persons, and it might easily be refuted, but we can assure the importers that there is not the smallest use in arguing against it. The Republican majority has contracted for cash with the manufacturers to look at importers in this light, and cannot be dislodged from its position except by a larger payment. The only remedy for foreign traders that we know of is to put up in 1892 more money than the domestic-industry people, for the campaign chest. See Quay beforehand, and he will make it all right.

The Republicans are naturally in a quandary what to do about their leader, Mr. Quay. Mr. Clarkson, the late Assistant Postmaster-General, who is one of the shrewdest of the managers, when consulted the other day about what had better be done, said: "Mr. Quay would not be permitted to resign by the National Committee if he wished to do so. He talked about resigning the week after election, but the members would not hear of it. He has expressed himself to the same effect several times since, but the members hold the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feeling about it now as then." Clarkson is right and "the members" are right. They cannot let him resign. Resignation would be confession, and they must carry him along. If he should win the coming election in Pennsylvania, they will claim it as a "vindication"—a term which means not that a man has not committed the offences with which he is charged, but that they are not likely to interfere with his political career, and this is what Quay most cares for. If people vote for him, he recks little what they think about his character. The whole situation is most interesting and instructive.

In spite of the persistent efforts of the Congressional Committee which is investigating the Pension Bureau scandal, to prevent the inquiry from revealing anything unfavorable to the Commissioner, Mr. Raum, damaging disclosures continue to be made from time to time. At Monday's session Raum himself was forced to make the admission that his private secretary was both a stockholder in and the Secretary of the Refrigerator Company whose stock Raum is accused of distributing among the employees of the Bureau. It has been charged that employees buying this stock were given to understand that they would have better chances of promotion than their fellows who did not buy it, and it now appears that Raum's secretary was promoted after he took a share, though Raum says he never paid anything for it. The Committee used all its power to keep this evidence out, and it was only the sharp and unexpected questions asked by Mr. Cooper, the Congressman who is conducting what Raum's friends call the "prosecution," that goaded Raum into revealing it. Raum's explanation of why his private secretary was not required to pay for his stock is of itself a revelation: "Mr. Tanner was not expected to pay for his stock, and the same is true of half-a-dozen prominent Washington business men. We wanted to identify them with the enterprise, and we gave them stock for the use of their names, as is usual in the organization of such companies." When it is remembered that Raum has repeatedly denied that any employee in the Bureau held the stock in question, and that the company has been shown to be a swindle, this remarkable confession indicates that his administration of the Pension Bureau needs a thorough exposure.

Superintendent Porter's defence of his census is the most extraordinary thing yet developed in this national muddle and disgrace. He says that a prominent Washington editor called at the Census Office to complain that his family had not been enumerated, whereupon the Superintendent had the sheets from the district in question brought to his desk, and found that not only the editor, but every member of his family had been counted. "The information," says Mr Porter, "had probably been given out by a servant in his family, who neglected to mention it." The Superintendent says further: "I have had several similar cases, and in each instance the party complaining that he had been overlooked was found to be down all right; so I believe it is safe to say that in the majority of instances the people who do not think they have been counted in the census are mistaken." So we have a census made up in a considerable measure of the replies to a long list of questions regarding members of a family given by ignorant servant-girls! And the Superintendent of the Census actually claims that this sort of a census is all right!

The full returns in Speaker Reed's district show that he was chiefly indebted to Democratic apathy for his great majority. In Portland he ran 84 votes ahead of the Republican candidate for Governor, but as his Democratic rival also led the State ticket of his party by 39 votes, the Speaker's net gain was but trifling. In a few other places Mr. Reed led Gov. Burleigh slightly, but in some cases also he fell behind the State ticket, so that there is no material difference in the whole district between his total for Congress and Burleigh's for Governor. What gave Mr. Reed his great majority was the fact that the Republicans got out a much larger proportion of their whole vote than the Democrats. It was by no means a full vote, for the Speaker received only 16,812 ballots, while in the last election of a non-Presidential year (1886) he polled within 1,187 of his record last Monday, and in 1888 exceeded it by no fewer than 1,476; but the Democratic canvass was so utterly neglected that the party turned out only 11,959 voters, whereas in 1886 14,299 appeared at the polls, and in 1888 15,855. This showing will not avail to break the moral force of Mr. Reed's unprecedented majority, which stands at 4,853 this year, against only 2,433 in 1888 and 1,326 in 1886; but it makes it plain that the result was due rather to Democratic lifelessness than to Republican gains.

There is danger that the Republicans will overestimate the importance of their victory in Maine, forgetting that they won an equally decisive victory in September, 1874, while two months later the Democrats swept the country. It is well enough to dig out of newspaper files the exuberant despatch which James G. Blaine sent to President Grant on the evening of election day:

> "The result of our election is in all respects satisfactory. We have carried every Congressional district, have a majority, I think, in every county in the State, have chosen twenty-nine or thirty Senators to one by the Democrats, have elected three-fourths of the popular branch of the Legislature, and have given Gov. Dingley a majority, according to present appearances, of between 11,000 and 12,000, which is a handsome gain on last year's vote."

This was on the 14th of September, 1874. In October the Democrats carried Ohio for State officers by 17,000 majority, and Indiana by almost exactly the same majority, while in November they elected their candidate Governor of Massachusetts, gave Tilden 50,000 majority in New York, and secured almost two-thirds of the House of Representatives. The enthusiastic Republicans who are treating Speaker Reed's recent victory in Maine as the verdict of the nation, should consider these reminiscences.

The noisy attack which Congressman Boutelle, the howling dervish of Maine politics, has made upon Mr. Blaine through the columns of the Bangor *Whig*, is merely public announcement that Boutelle looks upon the Maine election as marking the end of Mr. Blaine's power in politics. Boutelle, the creature of Blaine, has come to the conclusion that Blaine is a "back number," and that Reed is the man for him to follow hereafter. In speaking of this change of leadership the *Times* says that Mr. Blaine has ceased to be the Man from Maine, Mr. Reed now occupying that position, and has become only a man from Maine. We should say, rather, that the two should be spoken of as the Man from Maine and the Second Man from Maine. The type remains unchanged, as do the political methods and morals of the leadership. Boutelle and his kind turn to Reed because they hope to get, through his power, what they formerly got through Blaine's, that is, offices for themselves and a share in the distribution of the spoils. Boutelle, in fact, serves notice upon the President that the Maine election gives him no excuse for further refusal to hand over the control of the Maine patronage to the Second Man from Maine. It will be interesting to see what answer the President will make. The chances are that he, as well as the great bulk of his party, will take Boutelle's view.

The *Evening Post* prints a letter from Mr. David A. Wells defining his position on the tariff question in answer to some criticisms of the Hartford *Times*. His position is that of all rational tariff-reformers. The furious free-trader who wants to abolish all duties instanter, is a creature of the protectionist imagination. If he exists in this country, or in any other, he exists in only very small numbers and only in the remoter mountain ranges of public economy. The reciprocity men have this sort of free-trader undoubtedly in mind when they are frightened and run away on being called free-traders themselves. But they will become more sensible by and by. Every man is a free-trader who acknowledges that commercial intercourse with foreign nations is a rational, profitable, and innocent thing. Absolute free trade, without let or hindrance in the shape of revenue duties, is almost as difficult in this world as perfect holiness. A reciprocity man is simply a man who recognizes the sinfulness and folly of some of his ways, and sincerely resolves to abandon them and strive after a better life. His condition, in fact, is somewhat like that of an African chief who has just been converted to Christianity, and is considering how best, without disregarding the claims of natural justice, to dispose of nine of his ten wives in accordance with the requirements of his new faith. Mr. Wells, we believe, has come to no determination as to accepting a nomination for Congress, and will not "work" for it. It must be offered him, if offered at all, with substan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tial unanimity; that is to say, he must be left untrammelled if he is to accept it at all.

Senator Saxton states in the *Tribune* of Monday that the features of the new ballot law for this State which are likely to cause most annoyance, and may lead to complications in practice, were added by Gov. Hill. These are the separate tickets and the consecutive numbering of the ballots, both of which had to be added before the Governor would approve the bill. The separate-ticket requirement was added in the supposed interest of Tammany Hall, but it is Tammany which is most alarmed about it now, for its leaders are afraid that the confusing number of ballots which each voter will receive at the polls, and from which he must select unaided those which he is to vote, will be the cause of Tammany losing from 10,000 to 30,000 votes. They fear that great numbers of their ignorant followers will either not go to the polls at all, or will not be able to vote as they wish when they get there. They must not blame the ballot-reformers for this situation, but the Governor and themselves. If they had been willing to take the Australian system in the simple form in which its advocates presented it in the Saxton bill, they would have had a much easier one to work than they have now.

There have now been put on record, from unimpeachable Republican sources, four emphatic protests against a straight Republican ticket in the approaching municipal election. Three of these protests are made by men who as practical politicians have no superiors in the Republican County organization, namely, Messrs. Van Cott, the Postmaster, Jacob M. Patterson, ex-Police Justice, and William H. Townley, the Republican leader of the Fourth Assembly District. The fourth protest, which is slightly less emphatic and more cautious, comes from Chauncey M. Depew, who, if not so practical as the three leaders above mentioned, is as uncompromising a party man as any one of them. The utterances of the four men are so comprehensive, and throw so far-reaching a light upon the relations of Republican politics and municipal government in this city, that it is well worth while to cite them in the order of their publication. Mr. Van Cott said, in an interview published by the *Evening Post* on August 13.: "The impossibility of electing a Republican to the Mayoralty on a straight Republican ticket is so palpable that I do not see how any one could regard the nomination of such a ticket as anything but the purest folly. There is not an iota of doubt that with three tickets in the field Tammany would have a comfortable majority." Mr. Townley said in an interview published by the same paper on September 1: "In nominating a straight ticket we should be doing just exactly what Tammany Hall wants us to do, and there is no doubt that, if we were to do it, we could get lots of good offices from Tammany in return for the action." Mr. Patterson said, in an interview published in the *World* on September 13, when asked if he had declared himself as opposed to a straight ticket: "I certainly did say that it was foolish for any Republican who knows anything about politics in this city to hope for victory here next November by running a straight ticket. Just so sure as there are three tickets in the field, just so sure is Tammany of victory." Mr. Depew's views were set forth in an interview published by the *Evening Post* on Saturday.

The Wyoming election of Thursday was notable not only as the first in a new State of the Union, but also for the fact that women participated in the choice of State officials and, indirectly, of United States Senators. The Territory has been reliably Republican for years past—or else it would not have been made a State by a Republican Congress; and that party has now carried it again, as was expected. But what an outrage it is that these few people in Wyoming—the total vote at the last election (women included) was only about 18,000—should be given as much power in the Senate of the United States as the million voters of Pennsylvania or the million and a third of New York!

The education of the British public in the matter of strikes is going on rapidly and will soon be completed. We presume the finishing touches are being given by the Southampton riots. The British public are very much in the position in which the American public were five years ago. Indeed, they are in a worse one, because no such folly as the London Dock strike and its concomitants had then taken place in this country. The misery of the situation is, that no large corporation can discuss a labor question with a trades-union on its merits, or can afford to make any concession worth mention without putting their whole business in peril. The Reading Road tried concession, and in a short time the management of the road had passed, as Powderly has admitted, out of the hands of its officers, and the men actually often stopped the trains when they met in order to converse on labor topics. The explanation of this is that, as a rule, the unions are composed of rather ignorant and hot-headed men, and are managed by very ordinary self-seeking men of the Lee and Powderly type, who are naturally desirous of increasing their own authority and magnifying their own usefulness by every means within their reach. If a corporation employing a large amount of labor yields to them, it virtually admits to participation in the control of the property a body of persons who, in controlling it, enjoy power without responsibility. Nobody in any other field, no matter what his talents or character, is deemed fit for power without responsibility over anything except over his own private property. The dangers of such power to character and temper are one of the commonplaces of politics and moral philosophy. Why, then, should the leaders of trades-unions be supposed to be fit for it? Why should Lee and Powderly be supposed fit to manage the New York Central, or John Burns and Tom Mann the London and Southampton Docks, neither of them having a dollar of the stock, and owing no account to anybody for any action he may take with regard to it?

The insurrection in the Swiss canton of Ticino was due to the same causes which, during the last fifty years, have made that canton the scene of frequent conflicts between the two political classes who are roughly designated as the Clerical *Sopraceneri*, the inhabitants north of the mountain pass of Ceneri, and the Radical *Sottoceneri*, those south of it. The Ultramontanes have for fifteen years had a majority in the Grand Council, and have carried things with a high hand, ousting officials suspected of Liberal leanings and replacing them by priests, reopening and multiplying convents, and making common cause with demagogues who preyed on the poor and ignorant populace. There was a bloody conflict between the parties in 1876, which led to the interference of the Federal authorities; and in 1878 one of the causes of contention, the rivalry between the cities of Lugano, Locarno, and Bellinzona, each of which had been by turns the capital of the canton, was thought to be removed by the definitive selection of Bellinzona. In 1883 the canton adopted the *referendum*, by which any laws made by its Government may, on the demand of a certain number of inhabitants, be submitted to popular vote for approval—a democratic safeguard of which, either in its obligatory or optional form, all the Swiss cantons, with the exception of Freiburg, have availed themselves, and which, according to cable report, was put into operation immediately after the suppression of the late revolt. When it is remembered that the preceding conflict between the Clericals and the Radicals, which was likewise put an end to by the Federal authorities, occurred as recently as March, 1889, it will be seen what little hope of permanency there is in the peace just now brought about.

The recently formed "Peasant Party" in eastern Switzerland, an agrarian association resembling somewhat our Farmers' Alliance, has perhaps added to the discord in the Ticino, whose Radical population is naturally open to revolutionary influences of all kinds. That organization may be destined to become an important factor in the politics of Switzerland, if one is to judge from the tempting overtures made it alike by thoroughly reactionary papers, like the *Berner Volkszeitung*, and radical labor organs, like the *Schweizer Socialdemokrat*. It is a curious fact, by the way, that the internal strifes of the canton of Ticino have not essentially disturbed the formerly sorely tried loyalty of its inhabitants, who are completely Italian in their language and characteristics. In 1798 the people—whose territory had been acquired by the Swiss League in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—chose to be included in the Helvetic Republic rather than in Bonaparte's "Cisalpine Republic," and the canton remained faithful to the Federal Government in the war of the Sonderbund in 1847.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE LAW OF POLITICS.

In spite of all exhortation and temptation, Mr. Kennedy, the Ohio Congressman who made the savage attack on Quay week before last, has printed his remarks in the *Record*, without any serious modification. The most important passage appears in the *Record* as follows:

> "He has failed to justify himself, and, though opportunity and ample time has been given him, he remains silent. His silence under such circumstances is simply a confession of guilt. An honorable man does not long dally when his honor is assailed. He has delayed too long to justify the belief in his innocence. He stands convicted already before the bar of public opinion. Under such circumstances he should be driven from the head of a party whose life his presence imperils. Lafayette, standing in the French Chamber of Deputies at a critical hour of the nation, said: 'France has done enough for Napoleon.' So I say the Republican party has done enough for this pretended leader; let him be relegated to the rear."

Now what we wish to observe to Mr. Kennedy and all other good Americans, in and out of Congress, is, that as long as Congress is engaged in its present occupation of trying to put money into the pockets of certain classes of the community by a series of interferences with the ordinary operations of trade and commerce, there is no use in "relegating Quay to the rear," because his place will speedily be taken by another "leader" of the same kind. Quay is the logical and inevitable product of the activity of his party during the past twenty years. The road on which he has travelled to the chief place in the party councils is broad and well graded, and is crowded with aspirants of the same kidney. When a government undertakes to make money for the people, instead of letting the people make money for themselves, money naturally becomes the chief interest of all men actively engaged in politics, and the man who can promise most money, and collect most money, and is most skilful in getting money somehow, inevitably becomes the chief statesman.

The rule which has given us Quay is as old as civilization. If a government devotes itself to war, the soldier becomes the chief man in the community; if it devotes itself to the promotion of commerce, the merchant and financier takes the highest place. If it undertakes, however, to promote public happiness by legislating cash out of some men's pockets into other men's pockets, by enabling the unsuccessful or the knavish or the incompetent to levy toll on their neighbors, to force their goods on people who do not want them, and to enter in their books the exact amount they can make by getting a tax put on or taken off, the jobber and gambler looms up as the political leader just as certainly as a wet dunghill steams in the morning sun. His appearance is simply a question of time. The catena of corrupt or tainted Speakers of the House, beginning with Colfax and ending with Reed, with which the Republican party has furnished American history, were unmistakable signs of the times. They began twenty years ago to show the party in what direction it was travelling. They were followed or accompanied by other signs not less portentous—the gradual filling of the Senate with millionaires of dubious antecedents, the gradual exclusion from public life of intellectual men of every calling, the application of the money standard to every problem of society and government, the taxation of pictures and books, and the consignment of all the thinkers of the country, whether ministers, professors, or authors, to contemptible insignificance as theorists, or "littery fellers," whose opinions ought not to have any weight because their powers of making money were so small.

The meaning of all these things was unmistakable. They meant that before the end of the century the Presidency and seats in the Cabinet would be sold for cash, and that the broker who managed the bargain would become the head of the party, the Chairman of the National Committee, and Senator from one of the largest, oldest, and richest States in the Union. That in addition to all this, and before all this, he should have been a known thief and a gambler, a man of infamous life, is nothing wonderful. He is where he is because he knows more than any man about the business in which the United States Government is engaged—the business of peddling out the taxing power to individuals for their private benefit.

If any one thinks this language extravagant, let him consider for a moment the chief result of the labors of the present Congress during the past session, the longest but one in our parliamentary annals. It now lies before us in the shape of the McKinley bill. This bill has occupied the attention of the National Legislature almost exclusively for six months. It fills fourteen columns of the large blanket sheet of the *Journal of Commerce*, and it consists simply and solely of a series of minute interferences with trade and industry for the benefit of individuals, firms, and corporations. Nothing is too petty for its notice. No man or woman in the United States can touch, taste, or handle anything from morning till night which our legislators have not meditated on as a possible subject of taxation for somebody's profit. One cannot glance over the list without being impressed, first of all, by the amount of human labor it represents, and then by the wonderful opportunities for jobbery it affords. No party capable of such an effort of perverted ingenuity can help producing a Quay; and when a Quay appears, it cannot relegate him to the rear. He is in his right place. He knows too much about the business in hand to be sent to the rear. France sent Napoleon to the rear, as Lafayette said, when she got tired of warring; but as long as her whole attention was given to the equipping of armies and the conduct of campaigns, she had to keep him in the forefront, monster though he was. A money-making government is, in fact, inevitably a corrupt government. The function of government is to give to legitimate human activity security and freedom. When it undertakes to show people how to increase their incomes, it can only do so by abusing the power of taxation; and when the power of taxation begins to be abused, the hour of the speculator, and briber, and gambler, and lobbyist, and thief has come.

"WHAT IS RECIPROCITY?"

Such is the Yankee-like answer which Speaker Reed is reported to have made last week to an inquiry as to what he thought the House would do with the Senate amendment on the reciprocity question. It is the only sort of answer which any one can make.

The Senate amendment provides "that the exemptions from duty of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, provided for in this act, are made with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing these articles; and for this purpose, on and after the first day of July, 1891, *whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the Government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which, in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable*, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just; and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country as follows," (the rates being then given).

If the House accepts this amendment, well may Speaker Reed, or any other man, say, "What is reciprocity?" What, indeed, would it be? Nothing more nor less than the caprice of the man who happened to fill the Presidency—be he a Benjamin Harrison, an Abraham Lincoln, or an Andrew Johnson.

The *Tribune* very properly lays stress on the argument which Senator Spooner made for the constitutionality of the Senate amendment. The Wisconsin Senator is an able lawyer, and he undoubtedly made the best case that was possible for the side which he championed. But it is altogether too much to say that it constitutes "a most convincing reply to Democratic sophistries and to the objections raised by Senator Evarts." Mr. Evarts challenged the Senators who defended the amendment to "offer an argument that, under our Constitution, this demission by Congress and this vesting it in the President is not placing in him the power to make a treaty, or a quasi-treaty, or an arrangement in that nature, without the Senate; or to raise revenue or remit it without the action of the House of Representatives, with which that power under the Constitution must originate." Mr. Spooner claims that "'it is not a delegation of legislative power," and says: "The act passes from Congress a completed act. The provision that upon the happening of a certain contingency, to be ascertained and declared by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proclamation of the President, he shall have power to suspend the provisions of the law placing certain articles named upon the free list, and that thereafter, during the suspension of the law as to those articles, certain duties shall be levied, is entirely in harmony with numerous precedents, and is justified by high authority." In support of his position he cites the decision of the Supreme Court in a case which arose under the non-intercourse acts of 1809 and 1810, and the President's proclamation of November 2, 1810, that "the Legislature may make the revival of an act depend upon a future event, and direct that event to be made known by proclamation."

Of course Congress may pass a law and make its enforcement or suspension "depend upon a future event." Ordinarily Congress enacts that a law shall take effect at a certain date. It may instead provide that the law shall take effect at a certain date unless a specified event happens in the meantime, directing the President to make that event known by proclamation. For example, it may enact that no duty shall be imposed upon coffee imported into this country from Brazil unless Brazil imposes a duty upon agricultural products of the United States sent to Brazil; or that a certain duty shall be imposed upon coffee imported from Brazil so long as Brazil imposes duties upon our agricultural products; and in either case leave it to the President to proclaim the happening of the contingency thus provided for. This would be perfectly plain, and everybody in each country would understand exactly what it meant. The President's only prerogative in the matter would be to ascertain officially and promulgate a fact well known to every business man in both countries, that Brazil does or does not impose any duties upon agricultural products of the United States. In like manner it might be provided by Congress that a duty of three cents per pound should be imposed upon coffee imported from Brazil if Brazil imposed duties exceeding a certain standard—say 10 per cent.—upon agricultural products of the United States. In this case, again, all that the President would have to do would be to ascertain officially and promulgate a fact already well known to the whole business world. In the same way it might be provided by Congress that coffee from Brazil should come in free so long as Brazil should admit free our agricultural products, but that a duty of three cents per pound should be imposed in case Brazil should impose any duties, or duties exceeding 10 per cent., upon our agricultural products. Here, too, the President's only prerogative would be that of executing a plain act of Congress "upon the happening of a certain contingency," to use Senator Spooner's words, or "upon a future event," in the words of the Supreme Court—the contingency or event being a matter of universal notoriety.

But this is not at all what the Aldrich amendment proposes. It does not provide that the President shall suspend the free admission of coffee from Brazil upon Brazil's imposing any duties, or certain specified duties, upon our agricultural products after a certain date. Everybody concedes that Congress might constitutionally pass such an act, and every business man would know exactly what it meant, and be able to govern all his ventures accordingly. But the amendment provides that the President shall exercise the power of suspending the free admission not only of coffee from Brazil, but of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides from any other country, and of imposing certain duties upon such articles, "whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied" that the duties imposed by such country upon our agricultural products are such as "he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable."

The Supreme Court decision which Senator Spooner cites says that Congress may make the operation of an act "depend upon a future event." What is an event? Webster says: "That which comes, arrives, or happens; that which falls out; any incident, good or bad." The action of Brazil in imposing any duties upon our agricultural products, or imposing duties higher than 10 per cent., or repealing certain existing duties—that would be an event, upon which Congress might make the operation of a law depend. But the action of Brazil in imposing certain duties which the President of the United States—be he a Benjamin Harrison, an Abraham Lincoln, or an Andrew Johnson—"shall be satisfied" are such as "he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable"—that would not be an event: it would be an exercise of judgment, or of mere caprice, which nobody else in either the United States or Brazil could count upon beforehand. Public sentiment in the United States might be almost unanimous that the duties imposed by Brazil were not "reciprocally unequal and unreasonable," but that would not prevent the President from deeming them to be so and exercising the taxing power. The President might thus exercise this taxing power, and Brazil might then make such changes in its duties upon our agricultural products as satisfied the entire business community in this country that the taxes which he had imposed upon imports from Brazil should be remitted, and still he could keep them on as long as he should "be satisfied" that they ought to be retained.

The truth is, that the Aldrich amendment places the power of imposing certain taxes upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides imported from other countries entirely in the President's hands, and leaves him to exercise it absolutely at his own discretion. If it becomes a law, the only man in the world who will know whether sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides are to come in free from any country during the last six months of the year 1891 will be Benjamin Harrison; the only man who will know whether, such articles having come in free from a certain country during 1891, they are to be admitted in the same manner during 1892, will be Benjamin Harrison. If Benjamin Harrison "shall be satisfied" that hides should come in free from one country and pay a duty of "1½ cents per pound" from another country, so it will be; and if he "shall be satisfied," after three months' trial of this arrangement, that he has made a mistake, and that the conditions as to those two countries should be reversed, so it will be.

If Congress can give the President such power as this, there is no reason why it should not give him all power. It is past belief that a Supreme Court which annulled the Civil-Rights Bill as unconstitutional would not also say of such an act as this: "We are of opinion that no countenance of authority for the passage of the law in question can be found in the Constitution, and it must necessarily be declared void."

THE CENSUS MUDDLE.

THE census taken by the Federal Government every ten years is a work of the greatest importance to every State in the Union. Upon the enumeration of the inhabitants thus made is based the apportionment of Representatives in Congress, and by consequence the number of members of the Electoral College for the choice of President allotted to each State. As this enumeration is made only once in every ten years, any blunder in this respect is irreparable for a period covering five Congresses.

But the census long since outgrew a mere enumeration of the inhabitants. Their division between the sexes and among the races, their ages, their occupations, the number of families and dwellings, the degree of illiteracy, the condition of agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and all the other means of subsistence—these and many more hardly less important details now come within the scope of the census. Its reports make a long series of great volumes, and are full of information of the highest value to all students of modern civilization. To say that so important, vast, and delicate a work should of course be committed to the charge of a man specially and peculiarly qualified for the responsibility would be, one would suppose, to state only a truism. It would appear obvious that the Superintendent of the Census should be a man fitted, by careful training, for his duties, and, above all, a man of such unblemished character that his absolute impartiality should be as much assured as that of a just judge upon the bench. Reckless partisanship should of itself constitute as insurmountable a bar to appointment as Census Superintendent as to appointment upon the bench.

The census of 1870 and that of 1880 were taken by such a man. Gen. Francis A. Walker received a good education before he left the law office for service in the Union Army, and returned to his studies four years later. In 1869 he became Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department at Washington, and in 1870 he was made Superintendent of the Census. The collection of statistics in that year was attended with the greatest difficulties in the South, owing to the disorganized condition of society in many of the States; but General Walker did the best that was possible under the circumstances. So successful was his management that he was naturally sought for the same place ten years later, and he dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charged its duties with the added wisdom gained in his position during the interval as Professor of Political Economy and History in the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale. He enjoyed the respect of the entire community without distinction of party, and nobody would have ventured to hint that he was capable of distorting the statistics which he collected in behalf of any party or interest.

We presume that it would have been impossible to secure the services of General Walker as Superintendent of the present census, for he became President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology several years ago, and would probably have found it impracticable to leave his post. But it would have been possible to secure a Superintendent of the Walker type: a man of the highest character and the most approved qualifications; a man who would have made fitness the test of appointment, and who would gladly have availed himself of the opportunity to bring his office under the Civil-Service Law; a man whose work would have commanded the respect of the whole country.

Instead of such a man, what did the President give the country? A Superintendent whose reputation was that of a self-seeker, unhampered by nice scruples in his quest of office; who was appointed because he had been the editor of a subservient party organ; who began operations by proclaiming his contempt for civil-service reform; who is believed—and especially by those who know him best—to be entirely capable of any degree of "fooling" with the figures that was likely to escape detection. From Francis A. Walker we made the abrupt descent to Robert P. Porter. A sample of Porter's methods is afforded by the system adopted to take the census of this city. Here is the metropolis of the nation, a vast aggregation of people from all parts of the world, speaking all sorts of languages, living in all kinds of crowded buildings. The task of taking the census in New York was beset by the utmost difficulties, and required the services of the very highest type of enumerators that could be secured. What type did we have? The method adopted by Mr. Porter's representative in this city was to send out to the "Jakes" and "Barneys" and "Mikes" who "run the machine" in the various districts this circular:

> DEAR SIR: You will please forward to this office the list of applicants that the Republican organization of your district desires to have named as census-enumerators. This list must be sent here on or before April 1. Yours,
> C. H. MURRAY.

Comment upon such a performance would be a waste of space. Is it any wonder that the count of New York returned by enumerators thus selected by the Republican Machine falls fully 100,000 short of the number to which the city is entitled by every test that has applied to all previous censuses? Is it any wonder that similar complaints of the grossest inaccuracy come from all parts of the country? Is it any wonder that the total population falls fully a million short of what every careful student of the problem, basing his estimates upon the results of previous censuses, has considered the minimum figure? Is it any wonder that even a Republican organ like the New York *Tribune* is driven to the conclusion that something is wrong, and that another Republican organ, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, declares that "the conclusion seems to be inevitable that the stories of inadequate enumeration which come from many sections of the country must contain a considerable element of truth, and that hundreds of thousands of persons have been missed by the census-takers"?

What a spectacle it is for a civilized nation, which has just celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of its establishment, to present—committing the most delicate and important sort of work to a lot of spoilsmen, and then finding, as might have been expected, that nobody can place any confidence in the result, although everybody must for ten years be governed by it!

CAMPAIGN METHODS.

It is to be hoped that the leaders of the Democratic party will take to heart the sound admonition which they are receiving from many sources on account of their ineffective canvass, or rather lack of canvass, for the recent Maine election. The figures of the result, as we have already pointed out, simply show that the Republican success was due entirely to the fact that a full Republican vote was polled. The increase in Mr. Reed's plurality was not due to an increase in the number of Republicans voting for him, but to the great falling off in the number of Democrats voting against him. That is to say, the managers of the Democratic campaign either made an unsuccessful effort, or no effort at all, to get their voters to the polls. They made no open effort to arouse voters to the importance of the public questions which entered into the election, circulated no documents, and held no public meetings. They made no attempt to enlighten the voters upon the merits of the Tariff and Force Bills for which Mr. Reed and his party were contending, or to refute the statements of the Republican campaign orators concerning those and other measures and doings of the present Congress. They declared that they had something far better than all these things to rely on for success, namely, a "still hunt," but it is doubtful, in view of the outcome, if they had even this.

Why were not the Democratic leaders as well able as the Republican leaders were to realize what an excellent opportunity they had for making party capital in this Maine election? They have been asking themselves that question during the past few days, and have been making other inquiries which ought to result in showing them where the trouble lies. They have asked, among other things, who is the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and have discovered that his name is Roswell Pettibone Flower, and that if he took an active interest in the Maine election, nobody ever caught any outward signs of it. We trust that they will follow up this line of inquiry, and seek to discover Mr. Flower's qualifications for the position he occupies and the reasons which prompted his election to it. Our word for it, fearless inquiry on this line will go straight to the root of one of the most serious defects in Democratic campaign methods for the past ten or twelve years.

The inquiry will not need to be either long or acute. Mr. Flower was chosen simply and only because he is a very rich man. He had no other qualification for the place than his ability to make a handsome contribution from his own pocket to the campaign funds, and his supposed ability to get similar contributions from the pockets of other rich men. In selecting him to take the direction of their Congressional campaigns, the Democratic leaders were actuated by the same motive as they were when they chose Calvin S. Brice to take the direction of their national campaigns. In both instances they were possessed with the idea that they must have a rich man because the Republican party had so many rich men in its councils, and it would be necessary to meet Republican money with Democratic money in the campaigns. No thought was given to the other aspects of party direction, such as experience and skill in organizing and conducting campaigns, or ability to comprehend the great questions at issue, and to devise methods for disseminating sound information in regard to them among the voters. These and kindred attributes were set aside as of secondary importance. Money was the thing to be got, and the man who had that was the "born leader" simply because of its possession.

The origin of this rich-chairman idea dates from the Tilden campaigns of 1876 and preceding years. In his State and national campaigns, Mr. Tilden was his own manager, and he was from the outset dubbed the manager with a "barrel of money." Yet it is generally conceded now that he was very parsimonious in the use of money, and that his great success as a campaign manager lay in his perseverance and skill as an organizer. He was a disciple of the "still hunt," but a "still hunt" under his direction was a very different thing from what it seems to have been in Maine. As he executed it, it was identical with the modern Republican canvass as it is planned and carried forward by such leaders as Platt in this State, Chandler in New Hampshire, and Manley in Maine. It consists chiefly in the careful and complete polling of the voters in every district of the State in advance of an election, in keeping them aroused to an interest in the canvass, and in getting them to the polls on election day. That was the direction in which Mr. Tilden spent his money and in which he spent what was of far more value, his great abilities as an organizer.

The trouble with the modern imitations of Mr. Tilden is that there is nothing in them except the money aspect. No one will contend that either Mr. Brice or Mr. Flower would have been thought of for his chairmanship if he had not been a rich man. Their choice confined the campaigns which they were to direct largely to the money basis of operation. It is scarcely necessary to say that for the Democratic party to attempt to beat the Republican party at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this game is to court disaster. The Republicans can raise a thousand dollars for every ten that the Democrats can muster, and they have raised it many times over without an effort. They will do the same thing again just as often as the issue is joined, for they have the wealth of the country at their backs at a time when that wealth was never more arrogant, and never more unscrupulous in the use of means whereby to increase and perpetuate itself. Could there be worse "politics," to say nothing of the morals of the case, than for the Democrats to continue this hopeless style of warfare?

No party ever had a finer opportunity and few a higher mission than the Democratic party confronts to-day. All its leaders need is the courage of their convictions and faith in their triumph. They had the way pointed out to them by President Cleveland in his famous tariff message, and if they could not see it clearly then, they have no excuse for failing to see it clearly now. Their work lies in educating the people concerning the iniquities and burdens of the Republican tariff system as intensified and aggravated in the legislation of this Congress. The people are ready and eager to hear them, as the interest shown in the county-fair discussions in this State bears ample evidence, and as the tone of the Republican press of the Western and New England States conclusively shows. From this time forward the Democrats ought to devote all their energies to the spreading of light among the people, by means both of documents and speeches. They ought to confine the rich men of the party and their money-bags to the important and suitable work of defraying the necessary expenses of this educational crusade, and to rely for success at the polls on the intelligence and conscience of the American people. On that path they can win both success and honor; on the one they have hitherto followed they can win neither.

Correspondence.

BAD POLITICAL ARITHMETIC.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The scholar in politics is evidently not well up in political arithmetic. Mr. Lodge, in his *North American* defence of the Federal Elections Bill, accounts for the Democratic resistance to that measure on the sole ground that, under its workings, the Republican party would carry the House of Representatives nine times out of ten. He ascribes the fear of such a result to the Democrats, and he hopes for it as a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Considering that the free vote and fair count in Congressional elections is only a means to an end, which the New York *Tribune*, with brutal frankness, declares to be "a hundred tariff bills," Mr. Lodge's object is in the main neither more nor less than to fasten upon the country a most oppressive set of customs laws, by the free choice of colored growers of cotton and corn, who, above all dwellers on American soil, are interested in free trade, and would, if possessed of any political insight, be the most thorough-paced free-traders. But I am not concerned now with his ethics; I am after his arithmetic.

He reasons thus: In the States other than South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, the Republican party is sure of at least 155 members; now, if by a "free vote and fair count" we can get fifteen Representatives out of these eight States, we shall always have 170 members on the roll, and that is a majority. Now, in the arithmetic of the schools, 155 + 15 = 170; but this equation does not hold good in politics. In the present House of Representatives, before any contestants were seated, there were sixteen Republican members holding certificates from the States of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, and one from the city of New Orleans. Without the aid of these men Reed would not now be Speaker. If five out of these seventeen Republicans had been beaten by Democrats, Carlisle would now sit in the Speaker's chair. A measure, therefore, which is highly unpopular in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, and in the city of New Orleans, and is likely to change five districts in those six States and in that city, is not a measure to insure Republican majorities in the next House.

That it is unpopular there, has been clearly shown by this time—first, by the adverse votes and abstention of Representatives Ewart, Coleman, and Frank; next, by the refusal of the Republican Convention in Tennessee to approve the "Force Bill" in its platform, and of the North Carolina Convention to approve it at all; and, what is most significant, by the rise of the Democratic majority in Kentucky from 28,666 in November, 1888, to over 55,000 in August, 1890. Mr. Lodge appears to us in the light of the dog in Æsop's fable, who lost the piece of meat which he carried in his jaws while snatching at its image reflected in the brook. And I will tell him two little facts about the Kentucky election, from which he may learn how much of a shadow he is grasping at when he thinks every black district in the cotton States is worth a Republican Representative.

The "white" counties in Kentucky are mostly Republican by heavy majorities. These have stood up pretty well even in the disastrous rout of August, 1890. The heaviest losses were seen in Louisville and in Christian County. In Louisville, where the white politicians thought the contest hopeless, and were unwilling to spend money or work upon "organizing" the black forces, the negroes did not vote at all, and thus the 11,500 votes for Harrison dwindled down to less than 4,000. Christian County, where the blacks form the greater part of what used to be a steady Republican majority, was captured in this wise: The Legislature last winter enacted a law for that county under which every voter got his written certificate of registration which he must show at the polls. Every negro in the county registered unmolested, for the shot-gun argument is unknown in Kentucky; but when the first Monday in August came round, it turned out that half of the colored Christian County men had *sold* their certificates, as common rumor says, at the rate of two dollars apiece, thus disabling themselves from voting. The farm laborers in the tobacco fields of Christian County who sold their birthright so cheap, stand many degrees higher in self-respect and in material well-being than the cotton-field hands of the Gulf Coast. What was done at Hopkinsville can be done more easily at Vicksburg or Mobile. By frying some fat out of the cotton-brokers and importers, a fund can readily be raised to buy off one-half of the Southern field-hands effectually between the days of registration and election.

In short, Mr. Lodge should understand by this time that he cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear; neither can he make a reliable political factor out of a poor, ignorant negro, devoid of self-respect and unsupported by his white neighbors.—Respectfully, L. N. D.

Louisville, Ky., September 7, 1890.

THE REQUIREMENT OF DEMOCRACY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I am much obliged to Mr. Casey for coming to my support, even with a tinge of sarcasm. The duty on works of art is indeed the extreme type of the whole tariff as a product, not of any honest theories of protection or free trade, but of anarchy, of lobby rule, of the prevalence of private over public interest, of the absence of leadership in Congress, and of any guiding national authority to control private and local factions, of the tyranny of party under the usurped despotism of the Speaker, of the want of personal responsibility anywhere—in short, of the necessity of the presence of the Cabinet officers in both houses. Think what it means to snap a tariff bill on the country within thirty days of its passage, forcing the duties on bonded goods to be paid by October 1, involving the chance, nay, almost the certainty, of a panic in the money market, with losses by millions and ruin to thousands.

To-day, however, what Mr. Casey is pleased to call my ingenuity takes a different direction. It is difficult to contemplate the speeches and the electoral campaign of Mr. Speaker Reed without a keen sense of a danger which it would be folly to ignore. So far from apologizing for his course at Washington as a necessity of the case, he glories in it:

"If we have broken the precedents of a hundred years, we have set the precedents of another hundred years, nobler than the last."

Could the impudence of egotism go further? All the jobbery of the session, Tariff Bill and Silver Bill and Force Bill, though I seem to notice a marked silence about the Pension Bill, is paraded in triumph:

"Government by the people is the noblest institution of earth, and there is no place where government by the people has reached so great a degree of perfection as in the United States of America."

If there has been anything which could be called government in Washington this winter, it has been the government of the Speaker, and the Speaker, so far from representing the "people," only represents a single district in Maine, and secondarily a majority of the private and party interests in the House which have elected him to his position—a position very different in theory from what he has made it in practice. No doubt his action and his success in Maine have attracted a certain amount of public attention, and the schemers are already at work to boom him for the next Presidency. That may or may not succeed; but if it does, we have no right to blame the people, but should look to the political arrangements which defeat and counteract the wish of the people. Mr. Reed is only another illustration of the perennial fact that the world always has been and always will be governed by personality. Our people, like all other peoples, demand a leader, a Gladstone, a Bismarck, a Lincoln, a Grant, while all our politics are carefully adjusted so that everything shall be done by majorities and minorities, by committees and commissions; that no one man shall do more than a fraction of anything, or can by possibility win any credit or just blame. The men of principle conform to law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and keep themselves in the background. The men without principle jump through the meshes of law, and present themselves to the audience with a bow and a "Here I am!"

Mr. Cleveland issues a tariff message full of sound and lofty sentiments, and leaves it to fall completely flat and his followers demoralized and disheartened. Mr. Reed bullies the minority, counts a majority to suit himself, will recognize no speakers but those of his own party, forces through legislation by such means, and then poses before the country as a man of action, while his followers throw up their caps, and the mass of the people, almost, but not quite, as easily led wrong as right, begin to rub their eyes and ask, "Is this, then, a Man?" We escaped from Mr. Blaine in 1884 only by almost positive proof of pecuniary abuse of official power, and within six years comes another pretender, if not personally yet politically quite as dishonest. The game is too dangerous.

Political reform, of whatever kind, in this country, to be effective, has got to take as its basis the giving at least an equal chance of distinction to honest and able men with that now given to men who are able, perhaps, but dishonest. That is the principle of what Mr. Casey calls my pet doctrine of putting the Cabinet officers into Congress; but it is just as applicable to every State and every city in the Union. The old cry of 'Measures, not men,' was as ruinous as it was false to human nature. Measures *through* men is what, if we are to stop our downward progress, will have to be the watchword of the future. G. B.

Boston, September 13, 1890.

THE ARCHITECTURE AT HARVARD.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I venture to call your attention to the following passage in Mr. Norton's interesting paper in *Harper's Monthly* for September on the condition, functions, and prospects of Harvard University:

"The value of the influence of noble architecture, simple as it may be, at a great seat of education, especially in our country, is hardly to be overestimated; and yet it has been either absolutely disregarded at Harvard, or, if recognized, the attempt to secure buildings that should exert this influence has been little short of total failure. If some great benefactor of the University should arise, ready to do a work that should hand down his name in ever-increasing honor with posterity, he might require the destruction of all the buildings erected in the last half-century, and their reconstruction with simple and beautiful design, in mutually helpful, harmonious, and effective relation to each other, so that the outward aspect of the University should better consist with its object as a place for the best education of the youth of the nation."

The object of this communication is less to question the justice of the very severe animadversions of the Professor of Fine Arts regarding those buildings erected for the service of the University during the last fifty years, than to ask whether the drastic remedy which he would apply—*admitting for the moment* that it is possible—would be consistent with the highest duties of the University towards its students.

In your notice of this paper (September 4), you summarize it as presenting "less a description of the University as it is than a general view of its lines of development in the last twenty years in connection with the collateral development of the nation." Now, if the older halls of the University, such as Massachusetts, Harvard, Stoughton, Hollis, and Holworthy, and Holden Chapel, which, as they are excluded from Mr. Norton's censure, may be supposed (in some degree, at least) to meet with his approval, represent without affectation or pretence the modest condition of art and civilization in the last century, and for this reason deserve our respect and veneration, do not the later buildings also emanate from the spirit of the times in which they were built? Are not they also records of contemporary history? Do they not present to the physical eye a general view of the lines of development of architecture, parallel with those of the University itself during the last twenty years "in connection with the collateral development of the nation"? And are they not for this reason deserving of a measure of respect as monuments?

Memorial Hall, the Hemenway Gymnasium, Sever and Hastings Halls, the Law School, the museums, and the other modern buildings of the University, not including Appleton Chapel, could not have existed in their present forms but for the exacting nature of certain practical requirements, for the condition of building materials and methods, and for the dominance of certain theories and fashions of design, at the times when respectively they were built. Some of these theories and fashions have been more or less superseded in the rapid and wholesome progress of the art by newer methods, which at present seem better adapted to prepare the way for the architecture of the future. It results, therefore, that the later modern buildings are better than the earlier; but all of them are the work of conscientious and loyal graduates of Harvard, over whose minds, it may be presumed, the vagaries of personal caprice and invention have had less influence than with many contemporary builders less fortunate in their opportunities for general and special training. It may fairly be assumed that these architects have presented in the later monuments of Harvard unusually just architectural expressions of the civilization of their times. Certainly, as regards practical construction and adaptation to the more complex uses and the more exacting conditions in the life of the modern university, these modern buildings are immeasurably in advance of all which preceded them.

Modern methods and conveniences are in continual warfare with the conservative instincts of architecture, but modern architects are compelled to adjust their methods of construction and design to these methods and conveniences, hoping and expecting that out of those adjustments there will be presently developed an adequate architecture for the close of the century. It is true that those modern buildings of the University are, from the point of view of art, merely a succession of hazardous experiments—so, indeed, were the temples of the Greeks and the cathedrals of the thirteenth century; but the accumulation and organization of precedents have in modern times imposed upon the architects a certain self-consciousness which has rendered the lines of progress in their art less consistent and regular than was the case with the ancients. Our advance is tumultuous, many-colored, and disorderly, but *it is an advance*, although none of us seem able to secure a point of vantage whence the scene may be viewed in just perspective, and the accidents and incidents of this progress may take each its proper place. May we not assume that to posterity these accidents and incidents of the art of to-day may become as venerable and significant as those of the last century are to us as we walk through the college yard? It would not have been difficult in the modern buildings to affect a spurious relationship with the older buildings by masquerading in "the colonial style," thus securing a uniformity which would be agreeable to the taste of many. But is there not a better lesson for the youth of the University in the honester method which has been adopted? May they not more clearly discern the character of the civilization of these latter years of the century by such methods, even if those methods have rendered it impossible to avoid incongruity in the styles of neighboring buildings?

Five years of the latter quarter of this century are more prolific of healthful change in all the arts than fifty years of the eighteenth century, and architecture, now at last, we hope, in sympathy with this material advance, is subjected to a series of quick transitions. The building of 1880 is different in style from the building of 1870 for the same reason that the building of the year 1250 is different from one of the year 1350. If in some of the later examples of those incongruities of style in the college yard we may not see, as some of us think we see, a hopeful sign that the true line of consistent and direct progress has been in them discovered, our children, at least, when they look upon Sever Hall and the Law School will recognize that among all the sons of Harvard none have done more distinguished honor to their *alma mater* than the lamented Richardson. The destruction of these monuments would obliterate one of the brightest pages in the history of her achievement.

How are we to be assured that the substitution which Mr. Norton proposes will be an improvement? Who is to judge in what style the new buildings, "of simple and beautiful design," are to be built? What pilot is to guide the new composition of art safely between the Scylla and Charybdis of mere archæological correctness, ideal academic conformity, and safe scholastic purity on the one side, and on the other picturesqueness, romanticism, and an undue infusion of personal habit and taste? Who shall decide what is best suited to the age and most in harmony with its spirit? Is there not a danger that the harmony thus obtained would be merely the expression of an individual taste, and not that of an age of artistic and intellectual progress? Would it not be far less interesting and significant as a matter of history than even the juxtaposition of modernized Gothic, Old English Renaissance, Southern Romanesque, and what not, which at present so offends the eye of the critic, but so fairly represents the irregularity and indecision of the lines upon which the art of our time has been working its way to some sort of triumphant finality? It is our fate to live in the midst of a period of transition and eager development. If architecture contented itself with falling back upon fixed and approved academic types of form, it would be immediately placed out of reach of the sympathy of the public, without which there can be no true architecture for our time. If the critics will be patient with the experiments through which the architects are trying to keep step with the material progress of the times; if, better still, they will give us specific criticisms instead of Rhadamanthine judgments, which condemn or approve and give no reason; if the new architecture, as it is produced, should awake a clamor of intelligent discussion instead of being received in dead silence, the elimination of the unfruitful or merely exotic elements and the growth of those which have in them the seeds of life would be much more promptly secured.

Henry Van Brunt.

Manitou, Colorado, September 9, 1890.

THE HARVARD THREE-YEAR COURSE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Until this year Harvard has steadily advanced her requirements, and all the time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been attracting students. There does not seem to be a call for the change on account of lack of numbers; we must look for other reasons for it. It is more than likely that her desire to become a great university may be the real reason. Perhaps she expects to detain many of these A.B. graduates for higher courses. May these hopes be fully realized: she is well equipped for the work, and it is a laudable ambition. The question that naturally arises is: "Would it not be better to leave the old four-year course as it is, and let the University course grow gradually?" Many of the professors now having but few students might do more work in the lower college classes. Is not too much work done by tutors? Would not Harvard very much increase her usefulness by letting her best men be felt more generally in the lower classes? We very often hear the remark: "I want my son to come in contact with the leading professors earlier in the course, so I shall send him to one of the smaller colleges." If Harvard can teach several hundred more in the regular courses, would it not be better for her to do her best work on those rather than on a limited number in the University course?

I am afraid that this three-year course is a concession to the too much hurried spirit of the times. Inside the college walls we have felt tolerably quiet, and have not been seriously jostled by the pushing outside. We thought it was making inroads when the elective system reached the stage at which a lad of twelve could decide what he would study in college. This seemed to us rather young to exercise a safe judgment in such matters. I should prefer that my boy at that age should be relieved of such exercise of judgment by a wise body of men. I do not want him to think of his future work until he graduates from college, or, indeed, until he gets his university degree. The greatest danger to broad scholarship lies just in this concession to the spirit of the times.

The application of steam and electric power to manufactures and locomotion has multiplied wealth a thousand fold, enabling a man to accomplish in a week what it took months to do a hundred years ago. This permits us to surround ourselves with the luxuries of every climate in the world, to build fine houses, wear fine clothes, buy many books which we may not find time to read, make extended trips abroad, etc. At forty we possess more wealth than our fathers could at seventy-five. Everything, though, is done at fever heat. Our wants increase as rapidly as our money, and we have to devote our energies more closely to business to keep pace with them. At fifty we have accumulated a fortune, but have also the white hairs and worn-out nerves of men of seventy. We are all trying to "get there," and the majority are succeeding remarkably well—we are breaking all previous records. A good many have retired to the palace at Danvers.

Would it not be just as well to keep this insane rush outside the college walls? Let the time-honored four years be kept for quiet intellectual growth. If there are a few who can do more than others, it will not hurt them to use the libraries freely, reading good books. One or two years saved at the beginning may mean five or ten lost at the end and a life marred by immature preparation for work. So far as my experience goes, we have had too much wit-sharpening and too little judgment-training in the schools. It would have been a great advantage to me to have had an extended historical and literary course, running parallel through the whole four years. Not only would it have been as valuable in the line of mental training as much that I did have at Tufts College, but at the same time it would have proved of great value in forming tastes that might not have been developed by accident in after life. The bright men will hurry through the sixteen courses in three years, and the dull ones will shorten the four years as much as possible. The very worst element that scholarship has to contend against—the haste to plunge into the strife of life—will be at a premium. Would it not be far better to require the full time and let students all do their best work while they stay, without this eternal pressing forward? Let us not teach them to consider the college course an unfortunate barrier which must be jumped as soon as possible. It will not hurt the bright man to have an extra hour for general reading and study outside of his regular work, and the great majority will find all they can do well to prepare themselves for the regular daily lessons. When they have been in the hot battle of life twenty-five years, they will begin to appreciate the calm seed-time they once had, and they will not be anxious for their children to commence the "rush" within the college walls.

I am afraid the three-year course will not result in sending many more men to higher honors or attracting more to the College. I would suggest the propriety of selecting a hundred leading men in the various walks of life and asking them whether, from their experience, they would advise the change for their own children. The opinion of the college professor and the recent graduate is good for their end of the line—the theoretical; but it will do no harm to supplement it with what those may advise who have had large experience and know what qualities success in life demands.

EDWIN GINN.

GRACE AT WASHINGTON'S TABLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Mr. Moncure D. Conway's letter to the *Nation*, published in the number for June 5, 1890, on the "Source of Washington's 'Rules of Civility,'" it is stated that the first twelve of the 'Maximes de la Gentillesse,' etc., "are entirely omitted from Washington's 'Rules,' as indeed are others of a religious character occurring elsewhere in the book, even including one advising attention to grace before meat (it is known that grace was never said at Washington's table)."

No authority for the statement in the parenthesis is given by Mr. Conway, and it would be obviously difficult to prove a negative of this sort. But an assertion directly contrary to it may be found in Watson's 'Annals of Philadelphia,' vol. i, p. 580, of the edition of 1870, published by Messrs. J. B. Lippincott & Co., where an account is given of General Washington's mode of life in Philadelphia when President.

"His dinner-parties," it is there stated, "were given every Thursday at four o'clock precisely. . . . The President himself sat half-way from the head to the foot of the table. . . . He always asked a blessing at his own table, and in a standing posture. If a clergyman was present, he asked him to do it."

The whole account from which this extract is taken is of interest, and in its details it shows the observation of an eye-witness.

Respectfully yours, S. C. C.

BALTIMORE, September 12, 1890.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just read the suggestive and sensible letter of "B. E. H." in the *Nation* for September 11. The question at once arises, however, why is the Old Testament to be treated freely and held amenable to the higher criticism, and not the New Testament? Are the Hebrew stories to be "treated as you treat the Greek, Roman, and Scandinavian," and the Gospel stories given to the children of our Sunday-schools as veritable history? This is exactly what the Unitarians were trying to do thirty or forty years ago, and which earlier than this roused the whole denomination against Emerson and Parker, not seeing the logical fallacy of it. Andrews Norton, John G. Palfrey, and George R. Noyes of the Harvard Divinity School were ready enough to discount the myths and miracles of the Old Testament or to doubt the commonly received authorship of its books; but when they came to the New Testament, another style of criticism set in.

Yet the time has come when the "higher criticism" of the New Testament, which can be read all through the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' to say nothing of single treatises on the subject, makes the authorship of the Gospels as uncertain as the authorship of the Pentateuch, and the miraculous stories of the life of Jesus as questionable as the Mosaic myths. "To conclude the whole matter, why shall we not have the courage of our convictions and act intelligently about them?"

J. C. L.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1890.

WORTH A CENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I add to the examples mentioned by yourself and Mr. Samuel Garner of the use of the names of small coins to express contempt, the once familiar "not worth a picayune"—the Southern equivalent of the Northern "not worth a cent"? Other every-day expressions in use among us are "not worth a pin"—"a button." Chaucer has "not worth a bene," "not worth an oistre."

Noticing "R. T." 's allusion to the intentional bad spelling of the members of the French Academy, I am reminded of *Hamlet's*

"—— *wrote it fair.*
I once did hold it, as our statists do,
A baseness to write fair."

C. C.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1890.

A NEW PUNCTUATION-MARK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In consulting dictionaries and other works of reference, one is often at a loss to know whether a compound word, a proper name, or the like is intended to be written with a hyphen or as a solid word. When such a word comes at the end of a line, so that it must be divided and part carried forward to the next line, the nature of the hyphen is ambiguous. Furthermore, the doubtful hyphen at the end of a line may leave the type-setter or proof-reader in perplexity when such a word is "overrun" to another line.

For instance, a careful writer is anxious to write uniformly "armorbearer" and "Beersheba," but the twofold use of the hyphen leads to an occasional "armor-bearer" and "Beersheba" to vex the soul of the author.

Why should we not adopt the German double hyphen [=] and use it to connect the parts of a compound word, reserving the single hyphen to indicate a break caused by the alignment? By some writers, I think, this usage is observed in autograph "copy," while others prefer to follow Longfellow's rule of never dividing a word, however long, at the end of a line, but carrying it all forward to the next line. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

print, however, are we not really in need of an open-hearted hyphen that will bear no ambiguity or treachery in its bosom? F. L. P.

CHICOPEE, MASS., September 11, 1890.

Notes.

THE Smithsonian Institution furnishes an example of the deadening effect on public spirit of State ownership. It is but a few years since we read in one of its annual reports the surprised announcement of the first addition to its endowment from a private source. The sum was small but significant beyond its amount. We are now permitted to make known the fact of two more additions to the funds of the Institution. The late Dr. Jerome Henry Kidder, a graduate of Harvard College in the class of 1862, left a legacy of $5,000, which has recently been paid over; and, Prof. A. Graham Bell having made a personal gift of $5,000 to the Superintendent, to be applied by him in any way he thought fit, Prof. Langley has assigned this sum also to the Smithsonian fund. Such examples will, we are sure, not be lost on those who have the means to imitate them, and who can appreciate the singular work of the Institution as an international disseminator of scientific knowledge.

G. P. Putnam's Sons will publish during the present season 'The Venetian Printing-Press,' an historical study based upon documents, for the most part unpublished, by Horatio F. Brown, with 22 wood-block illustrations; 'A Literary Manual of Foreign Quotations,' on a new plan, by John Devoe Belton; 'English Prose: its Elements, History, and Usage,' by Prof. John Earle of Oxford; 'The Life and Work of Charles Darwin,' by Charles F. Holder, introducing the series called "Leaders of Science"; 'The History of the 19th Army Corps,' by Lieut.-Col. Richard B. Irwin; and 'Fra Lippo Lippi,' a romance of Florence, by Margaret Vere Farrington.

'The Slaves of Sabinus: Jew and Gentile,' by Miss Yonge, and 'The Hidden Treasure,' by Lucy Ellen Guernsey, are in the press of Thomas Whittaker.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, have nearly ready 'Martha Corey,' a tale of the Salem witchcraft, by Miss Constance Goddard Du-Bois.

Ginn & Co., Boston, publish directly 'Handbook of Historic Schools of Painting,' by Miss Deristhe L. Hoyt, and new and revised editions of Myers's 'History of Rome' and 'Outlines of Ancient History.'

Rousseau "und kein Ende." The house of G. J. Göschen in Stuttgart will bring out a work of original research by Dr. R. Fester of Karlsruhe, entitled 'Rousseau und die Deutsche Geschichtsphilosophie.'

Rousseau is the subject of one of the best-known and most brilliant and elaborately condensed of the Literary Essays of James Russell Lowell which come to us in two volumes of the promised Riverside Edition of Mr. Lowell's Writings (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.). There will be ten volumes in this series for the public that does not indulge in large-paper copies. Handy duodecimos they are, with large type in a page of agreeable proportions; the covers in wine-colored cloth very simply and tastefully stamped. A familiar steel portrait serves as frontispiece to vol. i. It would be superfluous to touch upon the contents beyond the names of the Essays—a term which includes the Moosehead Journal, the Italian Journal, "Cambridge Thirty Years Ago," and "New England Two Centuries Ago," as well as a "Library of Old Authors," Emerson, Thoreau, Percival, Josiah Quincy, Carlyle, Swinburne, Lessing, Rousseau, Witchcraft. These are the product of nearly forty years of thinking, lecturing, and reviewing, and the unchanged product, for, in Mr. Lowell's badinage, which is both wit and wisdom, "I have refrained from modifying what was written by one—I know not whether to say so much older or so much younger than I—but at any rate different in some important respects; and this partly from deference to him, partly from distrust of myself."

"Popular Edition" is truthfully printed on the front of the volume comprising Emerson's 'Representative Men,' 'Nature,' 'Addresses and Lectures' (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.). This is, in fact, the union, on thinner paper, from the same plates, of the first and fourth volumes of the Riverside Edition, having all the qualities of the best, therefore, except the needlessly fine apparel, yet remaining a handsome and presentable volume. It is surprisingly cheap, and it ought to do much to promote a wider reading of an author whose prose has hardly less distinction than his verse; witness the opening of the "Lecture on the Times."

Style, Rhetoric, Language, Conversation, Literature, and Authorship, with "A Brief Appraisal of the Greek Literature in its Foremost Pretensions" and much other Greek matter, give unity of "Literary Theory and Criticism" to vol. x. of Prof. Masson's Collected Writings of De Quincey (Macmillan). The depreciatory "Appraisal" has been recovered from *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* of 1838-'39, and is here reprinted for the first time. It may even yet assist in the warfare against the classics.

The seventh volume of Mr. Worthington C. Ford's edition of the Writings of Washington (Putnams) covers the period from May 1, 1778, to July 29, 1779, with the emergence from Valley Forge into the French alliance, the Commission on the part of England to make terms for a dependent *modus vivendi*, the evacuation of Philadelphia by the British, the battle of Monmouth, the arrival and futile demonstrations of the French fleet, the plan of attack on Canada, the retaking of Stony Point, etc. To this generally bright complexion of affairs stands in marked contrast the growth of mercenariness and speculation in connection with the supplies of the army, the inefficient co-operation of the States with Congress, the withholding from that body of the best citizens in the interest of State affairs, the disaffection among the troops, etc. These occasioned very gloomy reflections in Washington's correspondence, throughout which his patriotism, generalship, and statesmanship shine pre-eminently. When Laurens proposed the arming of the blacks to expel the British from Georgia, Washington hesitated for fear the enemy would imitate; and, assuming that enlistment would be equivalent to freedom, he also feared "a comparison . . . productive of much discontent in those who are held in servitude." But he had given little thought to the subject, he added.

A second edition of the late James Macfarlane's 'American Geological Railway Guide' has been prepared by his son, James R. Macfarlane of Pittsburgh (Appletons). It is greatly enlarged over the first edition, and we can readily credit the statement that it has cost a great amount of work. It is certainly a valuable hand-book for the observant traveller as well as for the professional geologist, and especially for the student of geology. It contains a list of all the railroads of the country, with their stations and the geological formations occurring at each one. The roads are arranged by States, every State being prepared by or under the direction of the State Geologist or some other local expert of acknowledged experience. Numerous foot-notes call attention to matters of particular interest. Occasional references to geological papers on local subjects add to the value of the work, although the need of compression has prevented the mention of many that would have been of service. The double-column pages of railroad stations extend to page 420, and a six-page index of railroads closes the volume.

Prof. H. A. Hazen of the Signal Service has lately contributed to *Science* a series of papers on the Tornado, now published in book form by N. D. C. Hodges. Prof. Hazen objects to many or perhaps to most of the prevailing theories on the origin of tornadoes, and his book has therefore something of a controversial nature, at times verging on the style of a challenge. He rejects the generally accepted physical ideas concerning the effects of latent heat liberated in ascending, expanding currents of air; he even goes so far as to question the whirling of tornadoes as an essential characteristic of such storms. His own theory to account for them seems to be by electrical action in some ill-defined manner. His list of destructive tornadoes is shorter than has been given by other authors, and some good should come of the care with which Professor Hazen makes estimates of damage caused by these storms, although his scepticism may cause surprise in some respects. His assertion that an ordinary cellar is a sufficient protection from tornadoes is not borne out by some of the photographs of houses destroyed by them.

Cowperthwaite & Co. of Philadelphia publish a new edition of 'Warren's Physical Geography,' by Prof. William H. Brewer of Yale. The book has always been highly regarded by teachers, and will remain so in its new form. The maps are clear, and the illustrations as a rule are new and accurate. The general statement of the subject is simple and sufficient, and but little matter is introduced that the scholar will not comprehend from the context or from what has gone before. It appears to us, however, that the introductory definition—"Physical geography considers the surface of the earth in its relation to nature and natural laws"—is not well supported in the succeeding sentence: "It considers the earth as God made it, and the natural changes that are still going on." A scholar would certainly infer from the latter statement that there were two divisions of the science; but it does not seem improper to say that physical geography recognizes no such divisions. Natural changes are all that it is concerned with, these being synonymous with the theological statement of the first clause. The necessity for some geological knowledge in undertaking this study is recognized, but the application of this principle is not carried far enough. The Alps can hardly be regarded as mountains formed by fracture in contrast to the Appalachians, formed by folding with or without fracture. The Colorado cañon is mentioned as the most remarkable example of erosion, and plateaus are said to be "eventually" carved into "mountain-ranges" and valleys; but nothing is said of the much greater and truly eventual work of erosion by which the relief of land masses is ultimately obliterated. It is probably by reason of the need of compression that there is any ground for these criticisms—it is certainly difficult to say where space for an expansion of the geological statement could be gained; but the need of such expansion is appa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rent here as well as in all our present text-books on this subject. The last division of the book, on organic life, contains two sections that are particularly well treated, viz., the distribution of life with reference to abundance, and the distribution of life with reference to kind.

Remarkably compact and convenient is 'The Pocket Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals' issued by Lord & Thomas, Chicago. All essential information is given in the least compass and in very clear typography. We may mention here also the second annual issue of the 'Manual of American Water-Works' (New York: Engineering News Publishing Company), which became a standard work on its first appearance; and 'Poor's Hand-book of Investment Securities' (H. V. & H. W. Poor), a supplement to the 'Manual of Railroads,' showing the range of stock and bond values, 1878–1890; stocks and bonds listed on the New York Stock Exchange, 1879–1890; railroad dividends for eight years; bond-coupons payable each month in the year, with the place where; location of railroad general and transfer offices, etc., etc. As will be seen this hand-book possesses some indispensable features.

The Trustees of the British Museum have published in facsimile the magnificent papyrus of the Egyptian Book of the Dead obtained for the Museum in 1888 by Mr. Budge. The papyrus bears the name of one Ani, a "royal scribe" and "scribe of the sacred revenues of Thebes." It was probably written in the fourteenth century B. C. The colored vignettes accompanying this papyrus are among the most beautiful and most interesting of the kind known, and the accuracy of the reproduction is marvellous. The work is furnished with an introduction by P. Le Page Renouf, Keeper of Oriental Antiquities in the British Museum.

Ireland, the East Indies, and the North Pole have been reached by Part 24 of the new edition of 'Stieler's Hand-Atlas' (Westermann), now three-quarters completed.

Heligoland supplies a topic, with the best illustrations we have yet seen, to the current number of *Vom Fels zum Meer* (New York: F. W. Christern).

Mr. Edmund R. Spearman's short paper on the "Identification of Criminals in France" is the most curious of any in the *English Illustrated Magazine* for September. The engravings from photographs show how imperfect an instrument of detection the Rogue's Gallery is, at least in the case of men, whose growth of hair may make so much difference in their appearance.

Those who wish still another corrective of Mr. James C. Carter's view of Bentham will find it in *The Law* (Chicago) for September, which reprints an abstract of Judge Dillon's address on this reformer before the Ohio Law Association on July 17.

The National Civil-Service Reform League will hold its annual meeting in Boston on October 1 and 2.

— As an appendix to the 'Washington Astronomical Observations for 1885,' not yet ready for publication, will be printed Lieut. Winterhalter's report on the Astrophotographic Congress convened at Paris in 1887, to which he was a delegate on behalf of the American Government. This appendix is already issued separately, and forms the most generally interesting contribution from the United States Naval Observatory within recent years. The discussions and conclusions of the Congress are already sufficiently known, while the notes on those astronomical institutions of Europe visited by Lieut. Winterhalter after the Congress are full of useful information, and abundantly illustrated. It is to be hoped that the data of this report were not received too late for guidance in the construction of the new National Observatory at Washington. Though a photographer rather than astronomer, Lieut. Winterhalter has embodied in his report here and there a suggestion which the management of the Observatory ought not to feel above taking. The most important of these has been made over and over again—that the Observatory and its work should be under the general direction of a Board of Visitors. Without this as an initial step, it is hopeless to expect that any better work will be done in the new buildings than is now going on in the old. Apparently the institution does not possess within itself the power of getting out of ruts of its own making. Lieut. Winterhalter reports upon nearly all the important astronomical observatories of Europe, as well as some of other foreign countries, and amply sets forth their present condition and equipment. As an aid in the construction of new observatories throughout our country, and in modernizing the equipment of such institutions already existing, the report is invaluable. Few astronomers could have done better. Appendix ii, on Saturn and its Ring, 1875–1889, by Prof. A. Hall, is instructive as showing how an eye trained in a single department of astronomical work may be quite inferior in another. An observer's micrometric measurements may be beyond question; but negative statements and featureless drawings, far from proving the non-existence of certain well-recognized details of the Saturnian system, will only certify his inability to see them. Prof. Hall's conclusion, that the diametral dimensions of the ring-system are not subject to change, will meet with general acceptance.

—A work which many Americans might read with profit at the present time has been recently published by Georg Schanz, and is entitled 'Die Steuern der Schweiz in ihrer Entwickelung seit Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts' (Stuttgart: Cotta). The author holds a professorship in the University of Würzburg, and is one of the ablest of living political economists. His book 'Zur Geschichte der deutschen Gesellenverbände' appeared in 1877, when he was only twenty-four years of age. Of more general interest is his prize dissertation, 'Englische Handelspolitik gegen Ende des Mittelalters,' which was printed in two volumes in 1881. Since then he has written a number of treatises on financial and economical topics, all of which are distinguished for thoroughness of research, clearness of conception and statement, and scientific soundness of view. His history of taxation in Switzerland and its development from the beginning of the present century is in five volumes, and comprises in all more than 2,000 octavo pages. It might seem, at first sight, as though the amount of space devoted to the treatment of the subject were out of proper proportion to its intrinsic importance. But such is by no means the case. Although Switzerland is a small country, with less than three million inhabitants, it offers a greater variety of peculiarities arising out of its geographical position, ethnological character, political constitution, and historical growth than are to be found in any of the larger European States. The fact that the population of the Confederation consists of three distinct nationalities, without taking into account the survivals of the old Romanic stock in the Rhætian Alps; the relations of the Federal Government externally to the European Powers, and internally to the several cantons; the remarkable disparity between the cantons themselves in political organization, economical development, and intellectual culture, and the manifold forms in which the democratic idea is constitutionally embodied and practically applied, suggest problems the solution of which can hardly fail to be interesting and instructive to all who regard politics as a profound science, and not merely a periodical scramble for spoils.

—The first volume discusses fully the general question of State and communal taxation; the second, third, and fourth volumes describe the diverse systems of taxation prevailing in the several cantons; the fifth volume contains the texts of the cantonal laws and regulations on this subject, and is the only complete collection of them ever made. In view of the fact that the Swiss Government is supposed to be the simplest and most economical in Europe, and that democracies are reputed to be exceedingly vigilant in keeping watch over the public treasury, it is rather startling to learn that during the past thirty years the increase of taxation in proportion to the increase of population has been quite as great in Switzerland as in Prussia. In 1856 Swiss taxes amounted to 7.9 francs, and in 1886 to 37 3 francs per head. In 1851 Prussian taxes amounted to 10.76 marks, and in 1884 to 30.12 marks per head. This result is all the more remarkable because, the neutrality of the Helvetian Republic being guaranteed by the great Powers, her military budget is relatively small; and, owing to her geographical position, she has no expenses for the creation and support of a navy. The notion that a republic is a cheaper form of government than a constitutional monarchy, and imposes less heavy burdens upon the people, does not seem to be sustained by these statistics. In the Middle Ages and in early modern times the burden of taxation was made to bear most heavily on the poorer classes. In Bâle, for example, as late as 1729, an income of 50 florins paid ten pro mille, while an income of 10,000 florins paid only two pro mille. In the present century the tendency has been to reverse this ratio and to relieve the smaller at the expense of the larger incomes, so that in Bâle to-day a net income of 1,000 francs pays 2.6 per cent., and a net income of 200,000 francs pays 9.8 per cent. A curious phenomenon is the vast inequality of taxation in different cantons. Thus, a citizen of the Swiss Republic worth 1,000,000 francs and with an annual income of 40,000 francs had to pay in 1880 in Solothurn 2,000 francs taxes, but in Lausanne his taxes would have been 2,720 francs, in Bâle 3,025 francs, in Zurich 8,169 francs, in Berne 8,350 francs, and in Horgen 9,769 francs. During the past ten years an effort has been made to remedy this state of things by substituting a general and uniform Federal taxation for the special cantonal taxes, but with only partial success, owing to the popular fear and distrust of centralization and governmental monopoly. The alarming increase in the use of spirituous liquors induced the cantons in 1886 to put the whole control of the sale of alcohol into the hands of the Federal Government. This measure was a step in the right direction, and has been attended by excellent results from an economical as well as from a moral point of view. Our limited space permits us merely to hint at the variety of interesting topics growing out of taxation and intimately connected with the vital social questions of the day, which Prof. Schanz discusses in his exceedingly valuable work.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—Eduard von Bauernfeld, who died a few weeks ago at Vienna in his eighty-ninth year, was probably the most gifted German writer of comedies this century has produced, and he had, indeed, but few superiors, in his special field, in all German literature. While not as prolific as the now almost forgotten Kotzebue, or the rather coarse-grained Benedix, Bauernfeld obtained, as a delineator of the *bourgeois* class, as well as of the higher strata, of German society, a popularity which in the case of his "Bürgerlich und Romantisch," "Leichtsinn aus Liebe," "Die Bekenntnisse," etc., remains undiminished after a lapse of more than fifty years. To be appreciated at their full value, his comedies must be seen at the Vienna Burgtheater, for which they were all written, and with which his associations through life were of the closest character. In this respect, as well as in their literary quality, his comedies resemble the society dramas of the modern French stage, which derive from the acting of the best Paris theatres a perfume quite unattainable elsewhere, and essential to their full dramatic success. Bauernfeld's plays, however, possess neither the depth and classic polish of Augier's best work, nor the sparkle and dramatic interest of Sardou's, nor the peculiar moral flavor of Feuillet's. The texture of his plots is frequently of the thinnest, but his characters are well sketched, and the dialogue ripples on in a steady flow of pleasant wit and sally, which contrasts delightfully with the labored humor of other German comedies, the overrated "Journalisten" of Gustav Freytag included.

— Bauernfeld's early career was that of so many Austrian poets, of Grillparzer, Anzengruber, and others who pursued the thorny path of literature while in the service of the Government. He became a *Beamter* in 1826, rose by slow promotion, found his excursions into dramatic fields frowned upon by his superiors, and finally left the Government service in disgust. The success of his plays rendered him financially independent, and he became a social favorite even in circles which looked askance at the caustic and irreverent epigrams which he launched from time to time in the Vienna papers against the foibles of society. He shared Grillparzer's pessimistic view of life and morose ways, but he was a *bon vivant* for all that, and shone in his day in the gay assemblies of the "Grüne Insel," that famous gathering of Vienna authors, artists, and wits, whose intellectual tourneys, rollicking tomfoolery, and gastronomic pleasures were never more keenly enjoyed than when Vienna's political horizon was darkest. Like Holtei, Bauernfeld was a most fascinating reader of his own works. He retained his mental vigor to the end, and on his death-bed dictated to his nurse, who had been his faithful companion for many years, the last scenes of a new play. Owing to her influence, Bauernfeld, who all his life had been a free-thinker, sent for a priest during his last weeks, and showed contrition for the error of his ways. Such, at least, was the gleeful announcement of the Ultramontane *Vaterland*. Although markedly devoted to the fair sex, Bauernfeld never married.

THE EDINBURGH ART CONGRESS.

Transactions of the National Association for the Advancement of Art and Its Application to Industry. Edinburgh Meeting, 1889. London: 22 Albemarle Street. 1890.

THE first English Art Congress met in Liverpool on December 3, 1888. The second met in Edinburgh on October 28, 1889. In the meantime had been developed a full-blown National Association on the British model, with "The Most Noble the Marquis of Lorne, K. T.," for President, with fourteen vice-presidents, most of them earls or right honorables, a central council, five sections with their presidents and "honorable secretaries," local committees, etc., etc. The "Transactions" of the Congress, nobly printed by the Edinburgh University Press, fill a tall octavo volume of nearly 500 close-packed pages. All these noblemen, and privy councillors, and secretaries of state are associated "for the advancement of art and its application to industry." Apparently it is not, as with us, a few artists only that consider art of some importance to the state! In England legislators, hereditary and elected, have come to look upon the "advancement of art" as something worth effort. And this for other reasons than the general ones that art is "to be ranked along with science and religion as regards beneficent tendency," as the Rev. Dr. Flint put it in his opening sermon; or, as another speaker said, that it is "not an exotic supplement to life, but *as inseparable from it as hygiene.*" First hear what the Marquis of Lorne says in his Presidential address:

"The main purpose of our meeting is to show how *beauty pays.* . . . We desire among a practical people to show that it is that people's interest to make their work good in form as in stability, to clothe with the best combination of colors or patterns . . . the sturdy handiwork in which they excel all others, so that grace and force shall go hand in hand, helping each other *to attract customers in the world's mart.*"

And again, speaking of art instruction in Germany:

"It is certain that the influence of this teaching upon all forms of industry has been very marked, and that articles are now manufactured *which pay* because they are good and captivating in design." "He who pushes ugly wares into the market," he continues, "will now find that his defter antagonist can beat him by aid of design, and the form that takes captive the eye of the purchaser, . . . and every object that exhibits some new form of taste will have its *money value.*"

Hear, also, another speaker, J. E. Hodgson, R.A., who said: "I have been informed that . . . the infusion of a little more art into our products *would increase the income of the country by fifty millions.*"

Money value—that is the thing that interests a "practical people" in art. It is "the great sums that go to France" for artistic manufactures—it is the possible £50,000,000 a year that might be added to England's wealth—that makes such an association seem worth while to them. It would seem that we in America, who for thirty years have taxed the importation of pictures, and resisted by a tariff the "infusion of art," might learn something still from the mother country.

If, however, we might learn from England something of the importance of art to a country, can we learn anything from this Association as to the methods best adapted for its advancement? Would the calling of an art congress in this country be a wise step? Does the meeting of such a congress tend to any practical end? We hardly think so. The field of such an association is too wide, its object too vague and undefined, its membership too large and too miscellaneous, for fruitful work. Such a congress loses itself, almost necessarily, in more or less unprofitable talk. When too much ground is to be covered it is covered thinly, and the good actually accomplished by the Edinburgh Art Congress of 1889 we take to have been little. One or two resolutions were passed which were practical in tendency, but we do not know whether their passage effected anything. For the rest, the notable feature of the 'Transactions' is, that nothing was transacted. There were *papers read.* One of the radical troubles with such meetings is, that it is difficult to get men of real standing to attend them. In the section of Painting at the Edinburgh Congress, only two of the papers read were by artists of anything approaching to international reputation, viz.: those by Mr. Watts and Mr. Briton Riviere. Another trouble is, that it is quite possible that a man of genius in the arts shall be unable to write three lines of good English, and shall be quite devoid of any ideas worth consideration for practical purposes. Nay, while all the cranks in the profession are not good artists, many good artists are hopeless cranks, and such an occasion for limitless talk as is given by an art congress brings out inevitably the whole army of cranks, artistic and inartistic. The result is a great mass of chaff in which diligent search may find a few grains of wheat. Few people have patience for the search, and the wheat is practically buried in the chaff-heap. The few papers in this great mass of paper that we are considering, that were ever worth the writing, are hardly likely to be read. If these few had been written for some magazine or journal, they would have reached a hundred-fold greater audience and might have done some good. Where they are they are lost.

Let us take up the proceedings of the Section of Painting seriatim as a fair specimen of the whole. After a rather meaningless and inconclusive address by the President, Mr. Briton Riviere, comes a confused and inarticulate growl on the "National Position of Art," which shows Mr. Watts in the light of the artist who either has nothing to say or who does not know how to say it. Then Mr. Hodgson, R.A., falls foul of South Kensington because it has "opened a career to men of limited means which in former days required a considerable outlay of time and money"—in other words, because it is making too many artists and crowding the profession—and he is followed by another R.A., Mr. Horsley, who is also afraid of too much competition, and who has a hobby of his own in the demoralizing effect of the study of the nude, and proceeds to trot it out and prance madly on it before his brother artists and so much of the world as can be induced to look on. After them Mr. William Hole, R.S.A., known in this country for his illustrations of 'The Master of Ballantrae,' repeats, in a very fair imitation of Whistler's style, Whistler's dictum that the trouble with modern art is that art is too popular; and Mr. W. F. Yeames, R.A., mourns over the effects of "Competitions and Exhibitions," which have ruined French art and bid fair to ruin English art also. Mr. W. D. M'Kay, R.S.A., regrets the departure from "Traditional Methods in Oil Painting," and the loss of the "brown tree"; while Mr. W. B. Richmond, A.R.A., who considers these methods "slovenly," is as sad as his *confrère* over the fact that young Englishmen will go to France to study painting, and laments, in a style worthy of Sir Boyle Roche, that "Impressionism is in the air, a solid fact based upon the quicksands of fashion"! His remedy is to open a school himself, where, we suppose, students will "be taught to grind colors and to sweep out the studio," as he says they should be. Finally, Mr. J. Lawton Wingate, R.S.A., joins direct issue with Hodgson and Horsley, and maintains that the trouble with British art schools is that they give too little rather than too much attention to what he calls "picture-making."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What earthly good can come of all this talk—chaff, chaff, nearly all of it? The other sections are nearly as bad. Some of the architects read technical papers which are well enough, and in the section of Applied Art there is a good paper on "The Decorative Uses of Enamel," and another on "The Picturesque Treatment of Interiors," which reads as if its author had something to say if only he could manage to say it. A third is a very elementary scientific treatise on "The Colours of Nature." But in the same section Mr. Morris and Mr. Crane mix up a kind of Ruskinian socialism with abuse of Japanese art and American magazines; *and so it goes.*

It is strange how many of these men are bitten by the modern madness of trying to accomplish everything by legislation. An architect wants a "court of taste," with power to prevent the erection of ugly buildings; a sculptor asks for a Minister of Fine Arts elected by "a majority of the votes of the artists of the United Kingdom"; while Mr. Horsley will be satisfied with nothing less than "the formation of a National Art Party in the House of Commons"! No, gentlemen, this is not the way! Listen to Prof. Patrick Geddes, whose paper contains more sense than all the others here printed together. He says:

"The advocates of national and municipal encouragement of art, particularly among artists, very often speak . . . as if all that were needed were the voting of abundant subsidies from the central and local governments for art teaching or for the employment of artists; that is to say, they are, in this matter at least—although, of course, frequently, like M. Jourdain, without knowing it—State Socialists of the most distinct sort."

He seems to have had a not unreasonable fear that this Congress would "leave nothing behind it but popped corks and sandwich papers," and gives this advice: "Let members of the association . . . *individually* try to get something done, it matters little at first where they begin."

That is the gist of the whole subject. Ministers of the fine arts and national art parties can do no good. Government can hinder the progress of art (by 30 per cent. taxes and the like), but can do little to help it. "Encouragement of art needs to be the outcome of a *general leavening* of the community; it cannot be called into existence by a single act of authority." Try individually to get something done; art congresses are not the way. If you are a painter, paint as well as you know how. If you are an architect, build as beautifully as you are able. If you are a trustee of a school, try to introduce sensible art-training in that school. If you are a millionaire, found a public museum. What is needed is the "general leavening of the community," and every little helps. Societies and associations to be useful must have definite aims, or they will lose themselves in talk. In America, for instance, an art students' league, or a national academy, or a free art league may do good; an art congress would do little but harm. But individual effort in the work next to the hand will do more than all.

GERMAN EXPLORATION IN ASIA MINOR.

Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien aufgeführt im Auftrage der kgl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Beschrieben von Karl Humann und Otto Puchstein. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer. 1890.

THIS book contains an account of three journeys and a description in detail of the monuments of Antiochos I. on Nimrud-Dagh in Commagene. The first journey was made in 1882 by Humann and Domaszewski on behalf of the Prussian Academy of Sciences, and is now described by Humann. Mommsen had already published his 'Res Gestae Divi Augusti,' etc., having based the book upon the faulty copies of the Monumentum Ancyranum et Apolloniense. This publication left much in an uncertain condition, and an accurate historian could not but wish to have an exact copy of the Monumentum Ancyranum, at least, upon which to base an account of the 'Res Gestae Augusti.' Years ago Mommsen caused Mordtmann to be sent by the Academy to Orcistus in order to obtain an accurate copy of the great edict of Orcistus.* And so now this journey was undertaken by Humann and Domaszewski *primarily in order to obtain for* him an exact copy of the Monumentum Ancyranum. Humann, the engineer who has gained fame for himself by the excavation of Pergamon, was charged with the leadership of the expedition. It was his duty to obtain a plaster cast of the Latin and Greek inscriptions of the monument, and to make an accurate survey of the country traversed by the party. It was the duty of Domaszewski, the professional epigraphist (whose expenses, by the way, were paid by the *Austrian* Government), to make a careful study of the stone with the best results obtained from the copies of former travellers constantly in his hands.

In addition to this, the chief object of the expedition, they were instructed by the authorities of the Berlin Museum to obtain plaster casts of the most characteristic of the rock-sculptures of Boghaz-kieui (Pteria), in northwestern Cappadocia. The usual route from Constantinople to Angora is by way of Ismid (Nicomedia), whereas our travellers chose Mudania-Brussa as the starting-point of their land journey. Those who have travelled much in the interior would scarcely risk a long journey in a Tartar or Circassian wagon, at least not if they valued their own comfort and freedom from care. The vast majority of the so-called roads in Turkey are mere bridle-paths, but still there are a number over which a four-wheeled vehicle may be forced without serious danger to limb or life. The Turks themselves divide their roads into four classes: (1.) The Vapor-yol (railroad); (2) the Araba-yol (wagon-road); (3) the Haïvan-yol (horse-road); (4) the Haïvan-gitmes-yol. The name of the fourth class we make to order. Haïvan gitmes (a horse doesn't go), or Haïvan gidemes (a horse can't go), say the Turks when speaking of a road over which no animals can travel save only men and goats. This is of course the lowest order of road, but is met with or heard of oftener than one might suppose. The Vapor-yol, though called a "railway," is merely what might have been a macadamized road one day had it not been left in a wholly incomplete condition. The common people are much in favor of railways, although they have not the faintest idea as to what constitutes a railway, so dense is their ignorance. Now, as is well known, there is a periodical change of provincial governors (Vali-pashalar), and each new governor illustrates the proverb about the new broom by an energetic, though short-lived, attempt at road-building. He has no money with which to build roads, but has full power to force the inhabitants of his Vilayet to work on his roads for nothing. The peasants object strongly to this forced labor, but the Vali-Pasha sweetens the bitter pill by representing to them that his road is really to be a *genuine* railway. The roads radiating from the provincial capital are begun and pushed forward with fiery energy, and they succeed in building a very good highway for about five miles out, but then the energy flags, the peasants see that they have been duped again, and work on the road ceases until a new governor comes along. This is the usual tale, though we have seen a few roads carried out for much longer distances. We have also seen very good natural roads rendered all but impassable for long stretches by these fitful and ill-starred improvements.

The Araba-yol is the great commercial artery, and is found only between important cities. Even it is often nearly impassable in places, and that, too, in the immediate neighborhood of large and rich towns. The traveller who does not yet understand the secret springs of the Turkish mind is apt to wonder why this or that rich town does not mend the wretched roads that lead to it in the interest of its own commerce. The real secret of the happy-go-lucky "methods" of the Turks is to be sought for in that boundless selfishness which dominates all classes and races in the Orient. The Oriental feels that to expend money in any way by which persons other than himself might possibly be benefited is the very height of stupidity and folly. In like manner the hidden reason why the Provincial Government does not succeed in its fitful attempts at road-making is because, as Humann points out, *there is in strict reality no such thing as provincial government*, but only a series of corrupt officials, who trade posts at irregular intervals, and regard their country as a cow which by good fortune they are allowed to milk—others may feed and care for the cow, but as for them, their business is merely to milk her.

We have been led into these remarks about Turkish roads because of our surprise that Humann should have chosen wagons as his means of transportation for the entire journey from Brussa via Sivri Hissar (Pessinus), Angora, Boghaz-kieui (Pteria), to Samsun on the Black Sea. Any one who has intersected Humann's route at numerous points would at the first blush be inclined to doubt the possibility of making the whole journey in wagons, and in reading the account of the journey we have been amused at the recital of ever-recurring woes caused by the wagons. Wagons were not chosen in order to carry gypsum to Angora, because Galatia is one vast bed of gypsum; nor were they chosen in order to transport the plaster negatives to the seaboard, because the plates of the Monumentum Ancyranum were sent on *packhorses* to Ismid—Constantinople. The case was different in regard to the sculptures of Boghaz-kieui, for it was thought necessary to take a supply of gypsum from Angora in the wagons, which were then used for conveying the negative plates to Samsun. The journey was carried to a successful issue in spite of the many lions in the way, thanks to Humann's constant watchfulness and to several drubbings artistically administered to recalcitrant drivers. We can readily understand that the whole party drew a long sigh of relief when their eyes caught sight of the sea from the top of the mountain southwest of Samsun; from Humann's description we see that they greeted the Euxine with much the same joy as did the Ten Thousand when they saw the same sea from a mountain-top further east.

At Samsun our travellers found a full-fledged steamer Trust, that charges more for the short haul from Samsun to Constantinople

*Mordtmann failed to find the stone. Ramsay and Sterrett found it in 1883, but it was covered with a thick incrustation deposited by water which had trickled over it for many years. It could not be copied at that time, but in 1886 Ramsay returned to Orcistus armed with instructions and the tools necessary for removing the incrustations, and secured an exact copy for Mommsen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than for the long haul from Samsun to Trieste. Another trouble of an unexpected nature awaited the party at Samsun: the Custom-house officials were inclined to regard the negative plates as antiquities, and were disposed to confiscate them at Samsun, or at best to forward them to the authorities at Constantinople. But the experienced know how to set at ease the disturbed conscience of a Turkish official, and so it became possible to send the twenty-three boxes direct to Berlin without any overhauling by the greedy officials of Constantinople. At Constantinople the other twenty boxes containing the forms of the Monumentum Ancyranum were put aboard the ship along with their fellows from Boghaz-kieui. The boxes and all the negative plates reached Berlin in perfect condition, and later on the plates furnished satisfactory casts, so that now the world may study exact copies of the Monumentum Ancyranum and of the sculptures at Boghaz-kieui at its ease without even a suspicion of the great trouble, toil, and care it cost devoted men to put them in the Museum at Berlin.

Humann was no less successful in his route survey than he was in securing those valuable plaster casts for the Museum. He has given his beautiful route map to the world now for the first time, but, thanks to the abundant and never-failing kindness of Heinrich Kiepert, special maps embodying the geographical results of Humann's journey have been in the hands of persons deeply interested in Asia Minor for the past seven years. As we have already said, Humann was remarkably successful with this map, which he plotted on single sheets from day to day while en route. After he got home and had put the single sheets together in one continuous map, it was found that reckoning from Mudania on the Sea of Marmora, he could locate Samsun on the Black Sea within three kilometres of the point fixed by the survey for the British Admiralty Chart. This insignificant error was distributed.

Humann's account of his journey covers ninety-four pages of the present volume, whose size is characterized by the publishers as "high quarto." The contents are varied. The account is perhaps most valuable from a geographical and topographical point of view. A pleasing feature is the translation of many names of villages, mountains, and rivers into German. We only wish that this had been done consistently, since Humann, by reason of his life-long work among the Turks, has acquired a thorough knowledge of the language. Turkish geographical names are generally appropriate from the Turkish point of view, and describe a character of the landscape or designate an event in Turkish history. Sometimes the natives themselves have forgotten the origin of the name, and in that case the travelling archæologist, if he be learned in Turkish history, may enlighten them, and save from utter oblivion some important fact of history. An interesting example of this is the village name Sultan-önü. The name means "before the Sultan," that is, the Sultan's bulwark, or Sultan's *march* or border, and hence the Sultan's margravate. Now, in the year 1225 Ertoghrul, the chieftain of the hordes of nomadic shepherds that had swooped down on Asia Minor from their ancestral homes in Turkistan, gained a decisive victory over the Byzantines in a battle fought near Dorylæum (now Eski-Shehir). In return for this victory gained, Aladdin made Ertoghrul the Margrave, that is, the defender of this frontier against the Byzantines. Ertoghrul soon extended his fief up to the very walls of Brussa, while his son Osman increased the domain inherited from his father to such an extent that Aladdin, feeling his own end near, sent the insignia of the Caliphate to the victorious son of Margrave Ertoghrul. Osman became Caliph and Sultan, and proved himself so great a man that the whole nation assumed his name, and down to the present day know themselves solely as Osmanli (plur. Osmanlilar), the word from which comes our Ottoman. Thus the village Sultan-önü is the very cradle of the Turkish empire, and yet probably not a Turk of them all knows the important fact.

When one sees the bald, naked, inhospitable wastes of Galatia, the question comes unsummoned to one's mind: Can it be possible that those Gauls, after conquering Asia Minor, should deliberately choose for their own portion the most inhospitable part of it? Or, rather, must we not assume that they, being mere mercenary troops, were *assigned* to those inhospitable quarters by their masters, and were not their wars in reality efforts to break loose from this bondage and to conquer for themselves better homes? These questions are weighty, and historians should answer them fully.

What became of those old Gauls of Galatia anyway? They have been called the Frenchmen of Asia Minor; one French traveller says that they are there yet, having merely changed their language and their religion; and he avers that among the present Mohammedan inhabitants of Galatia, he saw the hair and eyes of Frenchmen. Our traveller had good eyes and some fancy into the bargain. Humann has a different theory in regard to them, a theory well worth calling to the notice of the learned world. The Kizilbash (plur. Kizilbashlar=Red Heads) is a religious sect scattered here and there throughout the empire. Humann found them in unusual numbers on his journey from Boghaz-kieui to Samsun. The term was originally applied to the heterodox Persians, and was afterwards transferred to the people of whom we are speaking, who call themselves "Alevi." They claim to be Mohammedans, and deny the allegation of Redheadism in toto. But, despite their denial, the Kizilbash villages are well known to the Turks, who pursue them with intense hatred and untold detestation. The Turks everywhere will tell you that the Kizilbash men and women come together at night into a secret chamber, extinguish the lights, and then celebrate nameless orgies. Perrot does not believe this tale, but still quotes the words used by his cavass in regard to the nocturnal meetings. These people mourn for their dead, a thing the Mohammedans must not do; they adorn the coffin with flowers, thus reminding one of Christian customs; they give wine to a newly married couple, a thing forbidden to the Turks. All these are customs which they could have only from Christians, and where did they get them if they are not themselves the descendants of the people whom the invading Turks found inhabiting the land? Their history would be somewhat as follows: In the hour of their need and their fear, they embraced Islam, dropping it when the first danger was passed. As time went on, they forgot their Christianity also, retaining only certain formal observances of the Christians. The assemblages of the Kizilbashlar take place always on a Thursday evening, when a pot of wine makes the round of all present. Now, Thursday evening is sacred to the Eucharist, and it is not impossible that this drinking of wine in solemn assembly may be a remembrance of the Lord's Supper.

The Kizilbashlar have a well-ordered family life and many children, which latter, at all events, cannot be said of the Turks. In addition to all this, their homes are clean and their fields are well tilled, characteristics which point to a race different from the Turks. It is certain, then, that they have been in the country longer than the Turks have; and, in short, are not these despised Kizilbash the descendants of the ancient Christianized Galatians? It would be interesting indeed to find that they are in reality Christians, fallen, degraded Christians, but still Christians. If so, then there opens up a new field for the activity of the American missionaries who are stationed all over Turkey. At any rate, we should like to call the attention of our missionaries to the Kizilbash, with the suggestion that they study this strange people and tell the world something more about them. Their very name *Alevi* may be a corruption of *Galati*.

One of the most interesting sites visited by Humann is Pessinus, the home of Cybele, the great mother of the gods, whose worship was introduced into Rome with much pomp and circumstance during the second Punic war. Texier visited the site in 1839 and came home with a grand yarn about temples and porticoes existing there in abundance. Hamilton, who visited Pessinus shortly after Texier, did not actually deny Texier's florid account, but made the following confession: "Such is their state of devastation that they are more interesting to the geographer than to the antiquary." Scholars therefore looked, and were justified in looking, to Pessinus as the site of important and instructive ruins. But when in 1861 Perrot and Guillaume visited Pessinus, great was their amazement and disappointment to find that Texier's plan of the city was wholly imaginary, and Perrot exposes Texier's untrustworthiness and calls his plan "a genuine archæological romance." Texier was guilty of more than one. Moreover, as a sensationalist, he even craved such notoriety as is gained by writing his name in public places. One of the royal tombs in the city of Midas was discovered by Texier. A narrow strip of trees conceals the tomb from view from the road, and hence its existence was not suspected until Texier found it, for which due credit should be given him. But we well remember our disgust when, as we were breaking through the undergrowth, eager to stand before the royal tomb, the first thing to meet our gaze was TEXIER in letters a foot high. It is no mere ephemeral scratch, either, but a lasting disfigurement of the tomb. The work was done deliberately and skilfully with the help of an iron tool, so that a thousand years from now the world will know that Texier was the first European to lay eyes on this tomb.

In the year 190 B. C., the Roman Consul Manlius, coming with his army from Synnada, threw a bridge, says Livy, over the Sangarius in the neighborhood of Pessinus, whose delegates and priests of Cybele called upon him at the bridge. The next day the army of Manlius encamped at Gordium, the city that had become proverbial from a certain feat of Alexander the Great. The site of Gordium has always puzzled geographers, and puzzles them still. Several questions must be answered before we can even begin to hunt for it: (1.) Did Manlius take his army across the Sangarius bridge and then march one day's journey on the left bank of the river to Gordium? Or (2) after receiving the submission of Pessinus, through her delegates and priests, did he recross the bridge and march on one day's journey on the right bank of the river to Gordium? (3.) Did he go up or down the river? (4.) In speaking of the Sangarius, which fork does

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Livy have in mind? Humann thinks that the left fork must be meant, since otherwise Livy could not say that the bridge was in the neighborhood of Pessinus; he furthermore believes that Manlius crossed the bridge and marched down its left bank to Gordium. Now, there is no ancient site within a day's journey in this direction. But near Tchakmak, Humann found ruins of uncertain age, and so, with much doubt and hesitation, he suggests them as the site of Gordium. Ramsay and Sterrett visited all this region two years after Humann, and spent fully a week in a continuous search for Gordium, but failed to find any trace of the city below Pessinus. Accordingly they were inclined to suspect that Gordium lay somewhere west of Pessinus, and not south or east. But the site is, in our opinion, still to be found.

The world knows well what relics of antiquity are still to be seen at Angora, Boghaz-kieui, and Euyuk, but the plates which accompany the volume before us give some new illustrations of the rock-sculptures of the two latter places. In gazing upon those sculptures we naturally ask, Who chiselled them, who built the palaces? They have been called Hittites, Syro-Cappadocians, Anatolians. But their name is forgotten, their very nationality is not known, and yet they are immortal, those men who carved on the rocks of Boghaz-kieui the praises of kings and of gods no less mortal than themselves, for the kings and their gods are gone, while the spirit of the people who could produce those sculptures in the infancy of the human race lives on for ever.

If we have dwelt at length upon some matters suggested by Humann's account of his journey through Asia Minor, we can dismiss Puchstein's account of the first journey to Nimrud-Dagh in a few words. Puchstein, while on a "Studienreise" to Alexandria, was commissioned by the Prussian Academy of Sciences to call upon the engineer Charles Sester and get from him details concerning the monument reported by him to be on the top of Nimrud-Dagh, a mountain on the right bank of the upper Euphrates, near the frontier of Melitene and Commagene. Thereupon he was requested by the Academy to visit Nimrud-Dagh in company with Sester, and report results to that body. Puchstein's preliminary report on the journey and on the important and surprising ruins of Nimrud-Dagh, was published by the Academy in 1883, and the present account is merely a transcription of his meagre day-book, which contains matter valuable for professional geographers, but scarcely readable by others. Puchstein did not improve, as he should have done, his opportunities for adding to our knowledge of the geography of the country traversed by him, but he confesses this himself with modesty and humility, and, indeed, agreed to publish his day-book only when urged thereto by H. Kiepert. We forgive his shortcomings all the more willingly because of his description of the monuments on Nimrud-Dagh. The valuable result of Puchstein's first journey is the fact that it led to a second with Humann as a travelling companion. But we have already overstepped the limits allotted to us, and can give no summary of Puchstein's masterful account of the tumulus of Antiochos I. of Commagene on Nimrud-Dagh.

THE ROUSSEAU REVIVAL.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Leben, Geistesentwickelung und Hauptwerke. Von Richard Mahrenholtz. Leipzig: Gebhardt & Wilisch; New York: Westermann. 8vo, pp. 176.

J.-J. Rousseau jugé par les Français d'aujourd'hui. Paris: Perrin & Cie.; New York: Christern. 12mo, pp. 575.

A DOZEN years have elapsed since the centenary of the deaths of Voltaire and Rousseau, when the friends and foes of both swarmed into print with tracts and permanent works which attested the vitality of these great forces of the eighteenth century. Meanwhile, in 1883, has been held the Rousseau exhibition in Paris, under the initiative of M. John Grand-Carteret, editor of the second work recorded above; in 1886 a bust of the Genevan surmounting a fountain was set up at Asnières; in 1889 a full-length standing statue was erected at Paris in the Place du Panthéon, with solemn dedicatory services in the temple from which his remains had been ejected by the post-Revolutionary reaction. The Rousseau bibliography of the decade 1879–1889, not too minutely compiled, fills ten pages of M. Grand-Carteret's book, which owes its inception to a corresponding Genevan work of 1878, 'Rousseau jugé par les Genevois d'aujourd'hui,' and to the centenary of the French Revolution, which Rousseau precipitated, and, through his misguided disciples, directed.

We owe to the same anniversary Dr. Mahrenholtz's masterly essay, which, even in passing through the press, has been overtaken by publications that throw fresh light on the particulars of Rousseau's life, and call for petty corrections. If this author does not attempt to focus the contemporary German judgment of Rousseau, he aims to make a true character delineation in broad strokes, to hold the balance even between worshippers and detractors, and to summarize the most recent researches. His treatment is, therefore, episodical, but orderly as regards time, and sufficiently detailed. The several abodes of the wanderer and his leading works furnish separate sections, and in the case of the writings great care is taken to point out the sources to which they are traceable, and their several effects on contemporaries and on posterity. At the end Rousseau's historical significance is considered, and an appendix gives much convenient chronological and bibliographical information.

The first question which arises, as to the authority of the 'Confessions,' Mahrenholtz answers by dividing them into two parts: in the earlier the autobiographical intention dominates, and had this been persevered in, we might have had a work surpassing Goethe's 'Dichtung und Wahrheit'; the later is consciously apologetic and defensive. In the one, Rousseau's reliance was mainly upon his memory, and his narrative is open to rectifications which have not as yet impugned his veracity. In the other, the documents were at hand and were used, sometimes verbatim. Here there is naturally a general accuracy as to events, but the author's views of individuals are tinged with misconception and exaggeration. As regards the famous difference with Mme. d'Épinay, Mahrenholtz, in default of disinterested evidence, suspends judgment on the capital point of the cause of the Marchioness's journey to Geneva; but he so far discredits Grimm as to declare that he alone of the philosophers can safely be judged from his portrait in the 'Confessions.' Readers of M. Grand-Carteret's volume will learn that it is the present conviction of Frenchmen that Grimm was the cause of Mme. d'Épinay's journey, and that she suffered a miscarriage by the way. Moreover, the editor says that any one can satisfy himself from the manuscript at the Archives that Mme. d'Épinay's memoirs often undergo a change of hand when Rousseau is in question; that pages have been cut out and replaced for the same reason.

The breach with the philosophers is dispassionately treated by Mahrenholtz, with sympathy for Diderot and D'Alembert, with justice to Voltaire, whose double-dealing and active hostility nevertheless are not extenuated. The more or less formal parallel with Voltaire is weighty, and of course runs through the work as it must in any estimate of Rousseau. The absolute consistency between the latter's private correspondence and his public utterances, while the reverse was true of Voltaire, is duly pointed out; and we may be sure that the Genevan's essential truthfulness has insured the steady growth of respect for his character, noticeable in the clerical counter-demonstrations of 1878 being mainly directed against the memory of Voltaire. The philosopher of Ferney, it is further remarked, was an aristocratic innovator, addressing himself to the élite, caring nothing for the populace, and believing in the reform of the establishment from above. Rousseau was his exact opposite in these respects—another ground for the prolongation of posterity's affection for him. Voltaire, Diderot, and D'Alembert, again, judged solely as Frenchmen, and were never quite emancipated from that Jesuit teaching which it was the mission of the 'Émile' to abolish. Rousseau was the one cosmopolite among the philosophers, yet truly patriotic, if in the sequel a man without a country. Voltaire, finally, plied his pen to the very last, while Rousseau's epoch-making activity was compressed into the period 1761–1765, but "to the Genevan more than to Voltaire belonged the future." Together their lives went out, their ashes were honored and dishonored. Houdon made the statues of both. Rousseau lived to contribute to the monument of the rival to whose genius, in his bitterest feeling of just or mistaken resentment, he never failed to do homage; and to defend Diderot against aspersion. No doubt he could have been as magnanimous towards Hume, whose course, in their lamentable quarrel, Mahrenholtz finds relatively blameless.

Of the 'Contrat Social' and its working on Robespierre and the Convention, Mahrenholtz observes that it produced an opposite effect from that which was intended. "Rousseau wished to protect the people from the arbitrariness of Church and State, while the Constitution of 1793, based upon his teachings, gave the upper hand to the meanest of all arbitrary despotisms—that of the mob." But the proper correction is applied in the observation that only Rousseau's high ideals could have led up to practical issues, and that in the cases where he was called in as a law-maker (by the Poles and the Corsicans) he evinced sound political insight. There might, in the same connection, have been cited the passages in Rousseau's correspondence where he smiles at those who seek to educate their children on the model of Émile. "Rousseau," says our German critic, "has been too exclusively regarded as an idealist and fantast; but however much the peculiarity and privacy (*Abgeschlossenheit*) of his thought led him into far-reaching plans for the future too little consonant with the tendency of his time, he had sharply and truly separated the practical from the purely theoretical." It is, however, the common fate of the idealist to be looked back upon as insane by those who see only that his speculations have formally come to naught, while they profit ungratefully by the larger liberty which he wrought for them by leavening the thought of the age. In Rousseau's case, it is true, his passion for seclusion, his suspicion of benefactors as well as of enemies, his ever-present sense of persecution seemed to bespeak a disordered mind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Mahrenholtz refuses to stamp as insanity a mania which grew out of very substantial facts in Rousseau's experience at the hands of Church and State, of Jesuits and Calvinists, and even of the philosophers.

We touch this question again when we ask whether Rousseau's end was suicidal. The evidence on this point is very satisfactorily discussed by one of M. Grand-Carteret's co-laborers, Dr. J. Roussel, who reaches the negative conclusion which is now the accepted one. Dr. Roussel considers Rousseau's general pathologic condition, and expresses the opinion of Mahrenholtz exactly when he says, "Quoique Rousseau n'ait nullement été fou, quoique la persécution n'ait pas été chez lui un pur délire imaginatif, puisqu'il a eu à lutter contre des ennemis très réels," etc. But he admits "un cerveau mal équilibré," and makes Rousseau a prey to hereditary hallucinations, and even goes so far as to theorize that the author of 'Émile' imagined children which he never begot and was physically incapable of begetting, and consequently never put in a foundling asylum—with the plausible alternative that there *were* children whom Thérèse persuaded him to believe his own. In the former case Rousseau's humanity is saved and his own account in the 'Confessions' discredited; in the latter, he did the unnatural deed, but at the expense of other people's offspring.

M. Grand-Carteret opens his "symposium" with a defence of Rousseau against his calumniators, written in a tone so warm as to imply a very strong and persistent antipathy. In fact, several well-known writers declined to contribute to the present enterprise, though they were not committed to mere eulogy. Maria Deraismes more sensibly improves the opportunity to express her reprobation of Rousseau for his narrow views of woman, apropos of the education of girls. There is a rather ineffectual attempt, by Hippolyte Buffenoir, to set forth the difference in the feelings of women towards Rousseau in his own and in our century: the most pertinent remark is that women nowadays do not form their judgment of him by reading his works. But the same thing must certainly be said of men, ignorant (rather than forgetful) what sources of intellectual stimulus and delight exist in the works of the most eloquent writer of modern times, apart from his political speculations or his voluntary revelations of his own weaknesses and vices. His dominating musical gift, candidly treated in one of the best chapters of M. Grand-Carteret's volume by M. Arthur Pougin, gives not only his Musical Dictionary to browse in, but the immortal Letter on French Music. His passion for pedestrianism and herborising introduces us to endless excursions in unmatched description of natural scenery and outdoor life. His 'Émile' is still the *point de repère* for every student of education. His letters are a mine of suggestion as well as models of style. Through all his works, the 'Confessions' not excepted, there runs the accent of sincerity. In the most offensive portions we acquit him of any corrupting purpose, as we cannot the realists of the present day. The more thorough one's familiarity with his works, the more impossible it appears to us to disagree with Mr. Lowell's conclusions that "in nearly all he wrote his leading object was the good of his kind," and that "the inmost core of his being was religious. Had he remained in the Catholic Church, he might have been a saint. Had he come earlier, he might have founded an order."

Be this as it may, the two works we have bracketed in this review are well calculated to revive an interest in the most interesting of the forerunners of the triumph of democracy; and, by their bibliographical apparatus, to direct the student to the proper sources.

Elements of Logic as a Science of Propositions. By E. E. Constance Jones, Lecturer in Moral Sciences, Girton College. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1890. Pp. 208.

PROF. SCHROEDER, in the preface to his important work on 'Die Algebra der Logik,' the first volume of which has recently appeared, says that the chief advance which has been made in late years in exact Logic is due to the labors of the American, Charles S. Peirce, and his school. The inmost secret of this advance, the luminous guiding principle to which it is due, is the fact that attention is concentrated upon thought-relations, and not upon the *words* in which they may happen to be expressed. The meaning of this may be made clear by an example. The older logicians said that in every proposition the copula is *is* (or *are*), and that it can be nothing else. The newer school looks upon this series of affirmations—

All men are mortal,
Every man is mortal,
Any man is mortal,
Being a man implies being mortal,
If any one is a man, he is mortal,
That one is a man implies that he is mortal—

as indicative one and all of the same state of things, as expressive one and all of the same kind of relation, and hence as properly subject one and all to exactly the same formal treatment. In other words, it is concerned, to use again the language of Prof. Schroeder, with the *canon* of logical thought, and not with an analysis of the psychological processes of actual thinking. The above unification alone, for instance, makes it possible to do away with the distinction between categorical and hypothetical propositions, and also with the distinction between the application and the signification (or extent and intent) of words; in any proposition the terms may be taken in either sense at pleasure without necessitating the slightest change in the *formal* method of procedure.

The last four of the above affirmations do not contain any very strong implication that there are any such things as men; hence, for the sake of unity, it is desirable to assume that the statement "All a is b" may still be taken as true when it is not known whether there are any a's or not. When it is said that there may not be any a's, it is not meant that the term a is logically inconceivable, but that it is perhaps not contained in an (understood) limited field of thought (what De Morgan has called the universe of discourse). How large the field of thought is at any moment may be gathered from the application which we attribute to our negative terms; if, in denying that a thing is a virtue, we intend to call it a vice, then our universe is moral qualities; if it may perhaps be an intuition, then our universe is probably all mental qualities; if we take into account the possibility of its being a tadpole or a musical note, then our universe probably is the whole real world.

The connected questions of the existence of terms and of a limited universe are hence intimately connected with a marked simplification of logical procedure, and are therefore of more importance than it would seem at first sight. Recent English writers on logic are in the habit of discussing them from a narrower point of view; and in the handsome volume which Miss Constance Jones has just given to the logical world she does not rise above this narrow point of view. She says, for instance, on the question of existence: It seems to me, in making the assertion, "All albinos have pink eyes," not only that one would not be naturally conscious of a doubt as to there being any albinos living at the present moment, but also that the presence of the doubt in the mind is not even apparent on reflection. This sentence betrays a twofold misapprehension of the position of her opponents on the part of Miss Jones. In the first place, it does not follow, from saying that universal propositions do not, by their form, *necessarily* imply the existence of the subject, that one must be in actual doubt of its existence in every particular case. In the second place, Miss Jones forgets that her opponents have a ready means of expressing the fact when it is known that the subject exists—they have merely to say that it exists. Their position is simply this: They ask that when they say, *e. g.*, "Who breaks, pays; and there are some who break," they shall not be considered to have said over again in the second part of the sentence what they had already said once in the first; and they ask this for the weighty reason, among others, that it enables them to assimilate the treatment of compound propositions to that of simple ones.

Miss Jones has very acute reasoning powers, a great deal of boldness and originality, and untiring patience in tracking out minute distinctions in terms and in propositions. It is a pity that she has not taken a less mechanical, a larger and more common-sense, view of a number of debatable questions. She makes, for instance, too much of the distinction between adjectives and nouns. All names are abstractions. The difference between adjectives and nouns, as far as logic is concerned, is simply that adjectives are more abstract than nouns, and that on account of their having hardly any attributes predicable of them, they have little occasion to stand as subjects of propositions. Miss Jones is in error in saying that Mill distinguishes between attributes and subjects of attributes. Mill says plainly that Logic, at least, has no concern to postulate any substratum for attributes to be attached to; that, for Logic, attributes are not only all we know, but all we need to know. It is true that language is not sufficiently elastic to enable him always to speak strictly in the terms of this theory; but when he uses the word *thing*, he means nothing different from a congeries of attributes. Substance-names are constantly being coined out of adjectives when demand arises; as in "The outs were in ill-humor," "Blue and green are cold colors."

Nor does Miss Jones make out a good case against Mill's view of the nature of induction. The difficulties which she feels have been well set forth and met by Venn in his recent book on 'Empirical Logic.' They are difficulties of a kind not altogether dissimilar to that of the old Greek quibble—that a thing cannot move where it is, and cannot move where it is not, and hence that it cannot move at all.

Although Miss Jones seems to us not to have made her case good in a great many of the questions which she discusses, her book is nevertheless a noteworthy contribution to Deductive Logic.

The French Revolution. By Justin H. McCarthy, M.P. Vol. I. Harper & Bros.

MR. MCCARTHY can hardly be said to have made the French Revolution more intelligible, but he has produced an entertaining book. Perhaps he had no further ambition; his rather airy comments upon the impossibility

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of assigning definite causes for such a phenomenon indicate that he has not aspired to the study of the philosophy of history. Nor can we blame him for this, since the epoch of which he writes has been so thoroughly studied that no one could expect to produce another proper history of it without a lifetime of preparatory labor, while its picturesque aspects are inexhaustible. For a littérateur there could be no hesitation in making choice of methods, were it not for such mighty predecessors as Taine and Carlyle. Taine, to be sure, may be regarded as not writing for English readers; but Carlyle! —the colors of his lurid picture are too strong, one would suppose, for any later artist willingly to place his canvas within the range of their deadening influence.

But Mr. McCarthy is so far from dreading this comparison that he positively invites it. His very captions would be thought by one who had read Carlyle to be borrowed from him. We have chapters entitled "The Diamond Necklace," "Count Cagliostro," "Sowing the Wind," "Brienne is Blown Out," "States-General at Last," "The Play Begins," "The Man from Arras," "Slow and Sure," "On and On," "Drifting," and others of like style, of which the suggestion can have come from but one quarter. Nor is there any lack of curiously close resemblances in the descriptions and characterizations, nor even in the construction of sentences. Conjunctions and articles are omitted, words and phrases are repeated, epithets are accumulated, absolute constructions abound, incessant resort is had to the historical present and to the prophetical future, and the author apostrophizes the persons and places and times and seasons and events with which he has to do after a fashion that will be for ever associated with Carlyle. This sort of thing is all very well for once: we must have variety in literary styles. But it is a mistake to regard such mannerisms as of the essence of the writer and not as mere accidents. Carlyle was a great man, and what he said and thought was of enough consequence to make his spluttering and fuming and raving and cursing relatively unimportant. Mr. McCarthy is an extremely facile writer. He knows the tricks of the trade thoroughly, and can do them so cleverly that the audience must be quick to catch him. But he is not a great man, and the serious manner in which he occasionally pronounces judgment upon historical events and causes, is not impressive, but amusing. He reminds one of the old comparison of the blue-bottle fly brushing his wings upon the pulpit Bible.

Yet it would be a mistake to ignore the usefulness of such books as these. Coleridge spoke of history that was not only popularized but plebificated, and although it would be too harsh to apply his remark to Mr. McCarthy's book, yet it is clear that if knowledge is to be communicated to the general, it must be put in shape to be assimilated. Carlyle is too strong for most stomachs; but Carlyle-and-water might be not too much for the tenderest infant. The French Revolution was a very interesting episode, and if people want to read about it, there is no reason why they should not get all the entertainment out of their reading that is possible. Mr. McCarthy will whisk them along with the slightest of effort on their part, and they need not be really disquieted by the solemn head-shakings with which he records many trifling occurrences. These events were, after all, not so potent as his mysterious winks and nudges would suggest, and he himself, if one watches him closely, will be seen to be quite cool about them.

It is said that easy writing makes hard reading, but it is not true of this book. It is very easy reading, and a great deal of it is good enough reading for any one, while the method of construction is of the simplest order. Prepare a great number of personal sketches spiced with as many allusions as possible, mingle them with a fair allowance of descriptions of places and public gatherings, unite the whole with a thread of narrative, and you have a history. We do not say that it is easy to get the knack of this, but, after the knack is gained, history can be manufactured in any quantity that the market will absorb. Nor would we deny that Mr. McCarthy has read most industriously in preparation for his work. Judging by his allusions, his industry has been enormous. Only let the reader bear in mind that pleasure rather than profit is to be derived from this book, and he may skim delightfully along through the last century in France in an atmosphere of piquant gossip, seeing much of what was seen and hearing what was heard by the people who lived then, and feeling at the end, like them, that this world is full of inexplicable vicissitudes. Perhaps the second volume may show more substantial qualities than this one.

La Confédération Suisse, par Sir F. O. Adams et C. D. Cunningham. Édition française avec notes et additions par H. G. Loumeyer. Basle: H. Georg. 8vo, pp. 319.

THE original edition of this book received notice in our columns at the time of its appearance in 1889. It may suffice, therefore, to say here that the translation is practically identical with the English text, but contains substantial additions in the form of footnotes. A commendatory preface by a member of the Federal Cabinet serves as a new introduction. The editor has really bettered the original, and the frequent notes bearing the initials "H. L." show excellent understanding of the subject. An instance of improvement may be seen in the chapter on the Referendum. The authors had given a list of the Federal laws which had been submitted to popular vote, with the results for and against. Now a proper study of the Veto is impossible without taking into consideration the number of measures which have been allowed to go into effect without demanding a popular vote. If we were to judge by the number of laws rejected out of the total submitted, it would seem as though the plébiscite were chiefly a machine for the baffling of legislators; but when we observe that, out of the whole number enacted, the measures rejected by the people are a small minority, and that frequently a vetoed law is adopted at a future and less complicated juncture, the tendency of the institution appears in a far different light. An admirable statement of the attitude of the Government towards Socialists and Anarchists, and the international position and policy of Switzerland in respect to these and other questions, is quoted from a late pamphlet by Prof. Hilty of Bern.

Reflections on the Motive Power of Heat. From the French of N. L. S. Carnot. Edited by R. H. Thurston. John Wiley & Sons. 12mo. 1890.

THIS work consists of a translation of Sadi Carnot's celebrated paper, a notice of his work by the editor, a life of Carnot by his brother Henri, an account of Carnot's theory by Sir Wm. Thomson, and an Appendix containing some extracts from his hitherto unpublished writings. The original memoir is now familiar to all scientific men. It remained long unnoticed, and may be said to have been discovered by Sir Wm. Thomson, who remodelled it in accordance with the fundamental conception of the equivalence of heat and work, which does not appear in Carnot's memoir, but which is clearly expressed in manuscript notes published recently by his brother. These notes form perhaps the most interesting part of the whole book. They show clearly enough the gradual development in Carnot's mind of clearer ideas of the nature of heat, in part at least from the study of the work of Count Rumford on the production of heat by friction. They contain perhaps the first perfectly clear statement of the equivalence of heat and work and of their mutual convertibility. The life of Carnot by his brother, and many extracts from notes not scientific in their character, bring out a picture of an interesting personality; and while we do not agree with Prof. Thurston in his estimate of the author as perhaps the greatest genius whom this century has produced, we must assign to him a position among those who have done most for the science of heat, and who have achieved an imperishable fame. The work before us brings together much valuable material in an accessible form for reference, and is an acceptable contribution to the early history of thermo-dynamics.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Ballou, M. M. Aztec Land. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Brown, Dr. J. Rab and His Friends. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Bynner, E. L. The Begum's Daughter. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Fiske, J. Civil Government in the United States. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Gardiner, Prof. F. Aids to Scripture Study. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
King, Capt. C. Campaigning with Crook. Harper & Bros.
Lea, H. C. Chapters from the Religious History of Spain connected with the Inquisition. Philadelphia: Lea Bros. & Co. $2.50.
Lowell, J. R. Literary Essays. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $3.
Macfarlane, J. American Geological Railway Guide. 2d ed. D. Appleton & Co.
McClurg, M. Virginia. Seven Sonnets of Sculpture. Boston: The Soule Photograph Co.
Ostwald, Prof. W. Outlines of General Chemistry. Macmillan & Co. $3.50.
Pollard, A. W. English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Starr, F. On the Hills: Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.25.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places. $2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
BALTIMORE.

Announcements for the next academic year are now ready, and will be sent on application.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

THE NATION.—A BOUND SET, also an unbound set, various vols., both bound and unbound; 25,000 odd numbers. Will buy, sell, or exchange. A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, N. Y. City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE PRESS OF

J. B. Lippincott Co.

The Latest Works of

ALGERNON SIDNEY LOGAN, author of 'Saul,' 'A Feather from the World's Wing,' etc.

Jesus in Modern Life.

12mo, cloth, $1.25.

"Mr. Logan's views are interesting, and many of his thoughts are bright and suggestive."—*Hartford Courant.*

"He treats his subject with reverence, and believes that the teachings of Jesus have an elevating influence on mankind. The book is written in a bright and engaging spirit."—*Boston Gazette.*

"It is full of clear thought, vigorous reasoning, and genuine erudition."—*Indianapolis Sentinel.*

Messalina.

A Tragedy in Five Acts. 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

"There are fine lines in the poem, but its most remarkable features are its dramatic force and its entire lack of obscure phrase and meaning."—*N. Y. Sun.*

"The action of the tragedy is rapid, and it is replete with gorgeous and picturesque descriptions, for which there is abundant material in the history of the court life of Messalina and Claudius. The characters of the Emperor and Messalina are powerfully drawn, and the others are presented with strong effect. As a dramatic poem the work is of high merit."—*Boston Home Journal.*

New Books by

SIMON N. PATTEN, Ph.D. (Halle), Professor of Political Economy in the University of Pennsylvania.

The Economic Basis of Protection.

12mo, cloth, $1.00.

"A temperate, thoughtful little book."—*Atlantic Monthly.*

"A very clear and exhaustive argument in favor of the protective tariff principle. It shows up the fallacies of the free-traders, and reveals the solid foundation upon which the protectionist stands."—*Evening Wisconsin, Milwaukee.*

"The style is simple and easily understood, and altogether it is a book decidedly worthy the attention of the student of social and economic problems."—*N. Y. Epoch.*

"It is a valuable addition to the argument for protection, and against the system that would barter the advantages of this great country for less even than the mess of pottage."—*Harrisburgh Telegraph.*

The Premises of Political Economy.

By SIMON N. PATTEN, Ph.D. (Halle), Professor of Political Economy in the University of of Pennsylvania. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

"A modest but powerful treatise. In its line, it is one of the marked books of the season, and to the student of deep and vital questions of economics it must be highly valuable."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

For sale by all booksellers, or will be sent by the Publishers, postpaid, on receipt of price.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY,

PUBLISHERS,

715 and 717 Market St., Philadelphia.

Charles Scribner's Sons'

NEW BOOKS.

Famous Women of the French Court.

Translated from the French of IMBERT DE SAINT-AMAND by T. S. PERRY. Each volume, 12mo, with Portrait, $1.25.

CITIZENESS BONAPARTE.

This volume sketches the career of Josephine from her marriage with Napoleon to the period described in *The Wife of the First Consul*—the most romantic portion of her life and the days of Bonaparte's greatest devotion.

ALREADY ISSUED.

THE WIFE OF THE FIRST CONSUL.
THE HAPPY DAYS OF THE EMPRESS MARIE LOUISE.
MARIE ANTOINETTE AND THE END OF THE OLD RÉGIME.

"Full of charm and interest, brilliant description, and strong, clear historical sketches."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

Introduction to Philosophy:

An Inquiry after a rational System of Scientific Principles in their Relation to Ultimate Reality. By Prof. GEORGE T. LADD, D.D. 8vo, $3.00.

This work covers the whole field of Philosophy and is addressed to the laity as well as to advanced students.

Earth and Man:

Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography in its Relation to the History of Mankind. By ARNOLD GUYOT. *Revised Edition from new Plates.* 12mo, with new Maps and Charts, $1.75.

The present edition of this standard work is printed from new plates, and contains new maps and appendices, bringing in the most recent scientific data.

Dr. Eggleston's Two Novels.

New Uniform Edition, each illustrated, 12mo, $1.50.

ROXY: A TALE OF INDIAN LIFE.

THE CIRCUIT RIDER: A TALE.

These two justly celebrated novels are now issued in a new and uniform binding, and will appeal to a wider circle of readers than ever.

*** *Sold by all booksellers, or sent, postpaid, by*

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743-745 Broadway, New York.

The State and Federal Governments OF THE UNITED STATES.

By WOODROW WILSON, Professor of Jurisprudence in Princeton College.

This book departs from the usual plan of making a mere formal analysis of the Federal Constitution and describes our State and national governments historically and practically. *Just ordered for use in all the Grammar Schools of the City of Washington.*

140 pages, cloth, 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers,
5 Somerset St., Boston.

Jarvis-Conklin

MORTGAGE TRUST Co.

Capital paid up, - $1,500,000.

Only Western mortgage company reporting to and examined by New York State Banking Department.

INVESTMENT SECURITIES.

6% DEBENTURE BONDS,
GUARANTEED MORTGAGES.

MUNICIPAL AND CORPORATION BONDS.
INTEREST ON TIME DEPOSITS.

239 Broadway, - - *New York.*

CAREFUL INVESTORS,

before placing permanently their funds, will write for

"A FIVE MINUTES' TALK ABOUT RELIABLE INVESTMENT SECURITIES,"

to

HERBERT B. CHURCH, Banker and Broker,
53 Congress St., Boston, Mass.

G. P. Putnam's Sons,

27 and 29 West 23d St., N. Y.,

PUBLISH THIS WEEK:

The Trees of Northeastern America.

By CHARLES S. NEWHALL. With an Introductory Note by NATH. L. BRITTON, E.M., Ph.D., of Columbia College. With Illustrations made from tracings of the leaves of the various trees. 8vo, cloth extra, $2.50.

The trees described include all the native trees of Canada and the Northern United States east of the Mississippi River. Mention has also been made of the more important of the introduced and naturalized species. The descriptions are such that any given specimen can be readily located and named by the help of the guide given in the volume.

The Story of Scotland.

By JAMES MACKINTOSH, LL.D. (No. XXX. in the Story of the Nations Series). 12mo, illustrated, $1.50.

"It is matter for thankfulness that a handbook of Scottish history, which is sure to enjoy such an extensive circulation on both sides of the Atlantic, has been written by a true-hearted Scotsman, in thorough sympathy with the great leading currents of sentiment, in politics and religion, which have made our country a moral force in the modern world, infinitely exceeding its size and population."—*Mail, Glasgow.*

READY NEXT WEEK:

The Venetian Printing-Press.

An Historical Study, based upon documents for the most part unpublished. By HORATIO F. BROWN. With 22 wood-block Illustrations. Limited letter-press edition, square 8vo, $10.00.

CHIEF CONTENTS: The First Books and their Printers—John of Speyer and Nicholas Jenson—How they Printed—From Jenson to Aldus—A Bookseller of 1484—The Epoch of Aldus—Books before Legislation—Earliest Legislation—The Guild of Printers and Booksellers—The Government of the Guild—The Venetian Press in the Sixteenth Century—The Inquisition—The Index and the Book Trade—Clemens VIII. and the Republic—The Clementine Index and the Concordat—The Ecclesiastical Attack on the Concordat—The Interdict and Fra Paoli Sarpi—Press Legislation during the Seventeenth Century—The Guild during the Seventeenth Century—Press Legislation and the Guild during the Eighteenth Century.

Little Venice, and Other Stories.

By GRACE DENIO LITCHFIELD. 16mo, with frontispiece, 75 cents.

Uniform with the above, Miss Litchfield's earlier volumes in new style of binding, handsomely stamped.

A HARD-WON VICTORY. 16mo, $1.00.
ONLY AN INCIDENT. 16mo, 75 cents.
THE KNIGHT OF THE BLACK FOREST. 16mo, 75 cents.
CRISS-CROSS. 16mo, 75 cents.

*** List of publications for the fall season and Illustrated Prospectus of the "Story of the Nations" sent on application.

SILVER, BURDETT & CO.,

PUBLISHERS,

6 HANCOCK AVENUE, BOSTON.

New York: 740 and 742 Broadway.
Chicago: 122 and 124 Wabash Avenue,

Choice new text-books and helps for nearly every branch of school and college work.
Illustrated Catalogue mailed free to any address.
Correspondence with educators is invited.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

416 pages, paper.

DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM

383 pages, paper, by EMANUEL SWEDENBORG. Mailed prepaid for 14 cents each (or both for 25 cents) by the American Swedenborg P. and P. Society, 20 Cooper Union, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED